"From CEMA to the EEC: The Development of British Cultural Policy from the end of World War Two to Membership to the European Community, 1945-1975"

Thesis submitted by:

Nicholas Delane Ellsworth

For the award of Doctor of Philosophy

Institute of Theology and Liberal Arts

St. Mary's University, London

March 2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

Students are reminded that the work that they submit for assessment must be their own. Please read the following statements and sign and date at the bottom of this form to show that you have complied: 1. This thesis and the work to which it refers are the results of your own efforts. Any ideas, data or text resulting from the work of others (whether published or unpublished) are fully identified as such within the work and attributed to the originator in the text, bibliography or footnotes. 2. This thesis has not been submitted in whole or in part for any other academic degree or professional qualification at this or any other institution. 3. Any chapters that describe the outcomes of joint research should be clearly identified as such with a statement inserted as a footnote on the first page and contributors named. Significant data, images or text resulting from the input of other researchers should be identified as such and attributed to the persons concerned by means of a footnote within the chapter. 4. It is usual to acknowledge the help and guidance of others who have assisted you during your research and preparation of your thesis. Such acknowledgements do not replace or obviate the need for individual attribution as discussed in points 1 and 3. 5. The University reserves the right to submit electronic versions of your draft documents for assessment of plagiarism using electronic detection software such as 'turnitin'. In addition, whether or not drafts have been so assessed, the University reserves the right to require an electronic version of the final document (as submitted) for assessment.

SIGNED: …………………………………………………………………………...

PRINT NAME: …………………………………………………………………...

DATE: ………………………………………………………………………….

"From CEMA to the EEC: The Development of British Cultural Policy from the end of World War Two to Membership to the European Community, 1945-1975"

Nicholas Delane Ellsworth

For the award of Doctor of Philosophy

St. Mary's University, London

March 2022

Abstract

This project was proposed after Britain voted to leave the European Union, and there was a noticed lack of discussion about the impact this would have on culture and art, and no discussion on Britain's earlier aspirations of membership. Previous research on British politics during her applications to join the European Community focused on traditional questions of diplomacy, politics, and economics; this project instead looked at the period of 1945-1975 through the prism of culture and cultural policy, exploring public art and heritage, questions of nostalgia, and relations between Britain, the Commonwealth, and the European Community The aims of this research were to investigate Britain's cultural policies in the decades prior to European membership to explore if there were periods in which governmental priorities seemed to align with cultural policies, affecting the role of the arts. This study took existing material relating to Britain's three EEC applications and freshly examined government's cultural polices during this period. Archives from government departments, museums and galleries, and popular press were used. The period of 1945-1975 explores Britain's transition from post-war Imperial presence to member of the European Economic Community. The original contributions this thesis makes is in how it looks at an already well documented and understood era from the prism of arts and culture, with discussion on politics only where necessary. The politics of decolonization and the European project are replaced with discussions around evolving British governments' priorities and the role of an arts policy. The findings of this research suggest the use of a cultural policy often reflecting versions of Britain that was in-line with political trends of modernism, the Commonwealth, and Europe; and argues that some British governments understood how to respond to an arts policy to promote their aspirations and proposed identities.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisory team, Dr Mark Donnelly, Dr Stewart McCain, and Professor Glenn Richardson, for their support, expertise, guidance, and supervision during this process. Thank you for reading numerous drafts of chapters and ideas, encouraging me to explore various avenues and supporting me in my research processes and keeping my spirits up when I seemed stuck and lost. Guidance and support during the lockdowns and disruptions to studies was much appreciated. There are numerous members of staff at St. Mary's University who provided me their support, encouragement, and friendliness, which is greatly appreciated. Thank you to my colleagues in the Doctoral College for being the friends and support we all needed to make it through. I would also like to thank the numerous archivists and librarians who helped me with my research and provided invaluable insight, especially those at the Labour Party Archives, The National Archives, and the Wiener Library.

It would be remiss of me if I did not thank my incredible support network for their love, support, and encouragement throughout my PhD, but also my previous master's degrees. To my husband Darren, I would not have been able to accomplish any of this without your unwavering support and love. Thank you for the many, many, morning coffees, late night gin and tonics, and for planning (and pandemic replanning!) our wedding. Your emotional (and financial) support made everything possible. Thank you for being my true partner. And to my parents; my mom Sherry and my dad Richard, and my stepfather Dragan and stepmother Tina, thank you for not questioning my being a student for 11 years! Thank you, Mom and Dad, for filling my childhood bedroom with history books and letting me go to museums instead of summer sports, and for always encouraging me to stay curious and learn more. Thank you to my sister Kristina for always supporting me and keeping my spirits up! There are many, many other wonderful friends, and colleagues who came on this journey with me. You are all wonderful humans.

Table of Contents

Chapter Six: Museum Exhibitions and Art Galleries

Total word count, including footnotes and bibliography: 85,413

Chapter One: Introduction and Literature Review

1.1: Introduction

This thesis is an examination of the development of policies relating to the arts and culture in a post-war British society. This thesis explores periods in which cultural policies could be seen to align with governmental policies and practices, and questions if government priorities could be seen to affect the role of the arts and cultural policies and their interactions with society, covering the period from 1945 to 1975. The case studies and chapters will explore the development of arts organizations within Britain and showcase the transition from a focus on preservation and maintenance, towards themes of modernization, cultural redevelopment, and national influence; attempting to understand how the arts have been developed and responded to shifts in cultural and political trends.

Previous research pertaining to Britain during the period which covers the loss of empire and turn towards Europe generally looks at Britain during her applications to join the European Economic Community with a focus on traditional questions of diplomacy, politics, and economics. There will be, of course, elements of the impact of politics and the Second World War on British culture within this thesis. Given the time period for this project, not covering these topics would be impossible and negligent. However, this project instead looks at the period of 1945-1975 through the prism of culture and cultural policy, exploring public art and heritage, questions of nostalgia, and relations between Britain, the Commonwealth, and the European Economic Community.

The central discussions within this thesis are framed around museums and art galleries, art and cultural festivals, and their relationship with politics. As this project is centered on the development and deployment of cultural policy from 1945 to 1975, examples from popular culture are found predominately only when necessary and as such, is not a main area of research found within this study.

As would be expected, the historical context of this project represents considerable changes to almost every aspect of British life, many of which focused on a rhetoric of modernization as a method for reshaping politics and the nation. Modernization can be found with the first post-war government under Attlee, when the Labour Party brought both social and economic changes to the nation, including the National Insurance Act in 1945 and the

National Health Act in 1948.[1] The Festival of Britain in 1951 furthered Labour's vernacular of rebirth and modernization of Britain, and following the Conservative return to Downing Street in 1951, the newness within British politics focused on Britain's imperial presence and economic growth. Labour's focus on technological advancements and hopes for a more classless, utopian society reflected the modernity of the Wilson governments in the mid-to-late Sixties. Both Conservative and Labour governments in the 1960s and 1970s looked towards membership within Europe as both a sign of modernization and a vehicle for influence. While there will be some minor dialogue on identity and nation, this thesis frames its discussions around cultural policy and how art, design, and heritage were placed among these transient discussions around modernization and renewal, and Britain's international presence.

Before beginning this discussion, it is important to define and understand terms that will be used throughout this thesis. The phrase "the arts" in this thesis refers to literature, film and television, but mostly refers to museum exhibitions and artworks. The term "modern" in this thesis refers to the term as used within art circles, which is based on "idealism and a utopian vision of human life and society and a belief in progress."[2] This interpretation of "modern" builds upon Raymond Williams' definitions of "modern" which means "something existing now", but is also interpreted as "improvement or improved".[3] These definitions can also apply to the term "modernity", which is being defined as referring to " a powerful set of cultural, political, economic, and spatial relationships that have fundamentally influenced the nature of social life, the economy, and the use and experience of space and time."[4] According to this definition, taken from the *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, the general characteristics of modernity include "an emphasis upon rationality and science over tradition" and "a belief in progress and improvement".[5] These definitions of modern and modernity will be used to refer to research questions around "modernity Britain" in the 1950s

---

[1] For more on Attlee and the Welfare State, see: Margaret Jones and Rodney Lowe*, From Beveridge to Blair: The First Fifty Years of Britain's Welfare State 1948-98,* (2002); Robert Page, *Revisiting the Welfare State*, (2007), in particular Chapter 2: Revisiting the Labour Governments 1945-1951; Henry Pelling, *The Labour Governments, 1945-1951,*(1984); Nicklaus Thomas-Symonds, *Attlee: A Life in Politics*, (2010), finding chapters 13-18 most useful; and Kenneth Harris, *Attlee*, (1995).

[2] This particular definition comes from the Tate Gallery, London (see: Tate. "Modernism – Art Term." Tate. Accessed September 17, 2021. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/art-terms/m/modernism). However, modern in this thesis can also be used as a term meaning "contemporary".

[3] Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society: New Edition*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 155-156.

[4] Rob Kitchin and N. J. Thrift, *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009, pages 157-163.

[5] Kitchin, *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, 157-163.*

and 1960s, and views of "modern" organizations like the United Nations, Commonwealth of Nations, and European Community.[6]

The term "accessibility" is defined as the notion of making access or entry to the arts attainable in all areas of Britain, not just in the major cities, referring to the ability for Britons to participate and enjoy the arts; and takes its definition from guidelines within the Arts Council of Great Britain.[7] This term will especially apply in discussions around the role of the arts within organizations such as the Welsh and Scottish Committees and the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts.

The most important and relevant term to define is cultural policy, as this is the core of this thesis. Culture, according to Raymond Williams, is "one of the two or three most complicated words in the English language", which Williams attributes to the word's "intricate historical development" and that in a contemporary setting, the word is now used for "important concepts in several distinct and intellectual disciplines."[8] Williams explains that today, the most common and widespread use of culture is in reference to literature and music, painting, sculpture, and theater; giving the example of a Ministry of Culture as an administrative organization that refers to and is responsible for supporting these specific activities, often with history and scholarship added to the mix.[9]

With this definition—that culture refers to the arts and its supporting administrative organizations—the definition of cultural policy, in this thesis, is developed.[10] Cultural policy is defined as "the sum of a government's activities with respect to the arts, the humanities, and the heritage."[11] This thesis will use this definition to help argue that cultural policy often views public involvement in the arts as a response to the notion that the arts are often managed by the State.

---

[6] For discussions relating to concepts of modernity and modernism in relation to the nation, see: Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (1992) and Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition* (2012).

[7] TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities.

[8] Williams, *Keywords,* 49.

[9] Williams, *Keywords*, 52.

[10] It is also worth noting that some academics nowadays argue that culture within political discourse is generally referred to as "the arts". For more, see: Kevin V. Mulcahy, "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches" (2006) and Adriene Sullivan and Beatriz Garcia, "What is Cultural Policy Research?" (2005).

[11] Kevin Mulcahy, "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches," *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 35, no. 4 (January 2006): pp. 319-330, https://doi.org/10.3200/jaml.35.4.319-330, 320.

This project was proposed shortly after Britain voted to leave the European Union, and there was a noticed lack of discussion on the impact this departure would have on culture and art, and little discussion around Britain's earlier aspirations of membership.[12] At the start of this project in 2018, my understanding of public history and the heritage sector had been shaped and developed over almost ten years of professional employment within the sector, working as an exhibition researcher, curator, and within museum fundraising and development in various historical institutions. From these viewpoints and experiences, the research questions that created this study arose. They are:

1) What was the significance of CEMA and how did the organization take an active role in shaping cultural policies during the Second World War?

2) How, and why, did the policies and activities of the Welsh and Scottish Committees differ from that of the Arts Council in England?

3) How did government funding and support for the arts increase in post-war economies, and did this align with contemporary politics and government priorities?

4) How did Labour use the arts to promote the party's version of modernity during the 1960s?

5) How were cultural policies affected by Britain's changing relationship with the Commonwealth and the European Community during the 1960s and 1970s?

---

[12] Some early studies that arose from Brexit which discussed the impact of Britain's decision to leave the European Union on the cultural and heritage sectors occurred/were published after the June 2016 referendum, and include a study produced shortly after the Brexit decision that was created by the Arts Council England in July 2016. This report, "The arts and culture sector and exit from the European Union" explores what many in the sector felt the most important challenges would be and the sector's concerns, which largely included funding, loans, and movement. Another study from October 2016 was compiled by Creative Europe Desk UK and submitted to the Culture, Media, and Sport Committee Inquiry. This study, "The impact of Brexit on the creative industries, tourism and the digital single market" discussed that during the years 2014-2015, Creative Europe had provided almost €40 Million in grants to the UK's creative industries and that much of the funding given by the EU to UK arts organizations came from Creative Europe, which was now at-risk following Brexit. This study reflects many of the concerns addressed by the earlier study created by the Arts Council England. There are later publications that address these issues, but many of them have been produced following Britain's official departure from the EU in 2020 and only respond to Brexit, not giving a full discussion on how the sector was feeling in-regards to Britain's possible withdrawal from the EU. The lack of conversations pre-June 2016 on Brexit and the Arts can be found in a study completed by the British Council over two periods—before and after June 2016—entitled "As Other's See Us: Perceptions of the UK from young people across G20 countries" asked numerous questions relating to British perceptions abroad, including opportunism, trade, and the impact of Brexit; however, any questions relating to the cultural aspects of this decision are not included. These are just a few examples, but they demonstrate an overall lack of awareness around the impact of Brexit on the arts and cultural policies and reveal no commentary whatsoever about Britain's cultural milieu prior to European Membership in 1973.

6) What was the lingering impact of German War Trials on British popular culture in the 1950s and early 1960s?

The common theme amongst these questions is the role of cultural policy and how, or if, politics was an influence in the development of cultural policies.

These questions will be answered throughout this thesis using several case studies whose main focus is to address one, if not more, of these questions. It is important to note that whilst this thesis was inspired by the impact of Brexit on British politics and culture, Brexit will *not* be part of the discussion found in this thesis. This thesis strictly remains in the period of 1945-1975, with an exception being Chapter Four: Cultural Policy, CEMA, and the Arts Council, which discusses the mobilization of culture during World War Two.

1.2: Literature Review

While the main focus of this thesis is on culture and cultural policy, due to the context and needed background discussions, this literature review will cover both politics and culture pertaining to this time period. Literature relating to popular culture, themes of identity or national identity, or memory, are not included in this review as they are included minimally in this study, and as such are discussed when mentioned within the thesis.

Many academics base their research and arguments around the political nature of Britain entering the European Economic Community (EEC). The common evaluation amongst scholars is to relate Britain, Europe, and their economic and political circumstances as the base of their argument, noting that it was these variables that made British entry into the EEC necessary. Older works include George Wilkes' *Britain's Failure to Enter the European Community 1961-3* (1997) and N. Piers Ludlow's *Dealing with Britain: The Six and the First UK Application to the EEC* (1997), both of which discuss the politics behind Britain's first application initiated by the Macmillan government yet give little understanding of British culture during this period. In these works, culture is often relegated to a footnote, acting as an afterthought in a discussion dominated by economics and politics.

There is a selection of texts produced in the early 1970s prior to achieving membership, which stress the political importance of membership yet avoid discussing society and culture altogether. These include Terence M. Lane's "Legal Implications of British Entry into the Common Market" (1972) and "British Entry into the Common Market: A British View" by Brian L. Crowe (1972). Both of these pieces offer an excellent glimpse

into the minds of British civil servants and legal professionals before the third application to join the EEC was accepted; and while they both make clear arguments on political gain, there continues to be no mention of culture, either European or British (and in that sense, that of the Commonwealth) in works relating to Britain and the EEC.

These gaps in research that ignore culture in relation to politics can be found in Mathias Haeussler's article *The Popular Press and Ideas of Europe* (2014) which discusses in detail the influence Fleet Street and the press had in swaying British opinions and views and is another text that discusses membership from exclusively a political viewpoint. In his discussion he contrasts the *Daily Express* and *Daily Mirror* and their audiences, and how the debate over European integration was conditioned by social, political, and cultural tensions in the 1960s. Yet even this article focuses on the press's representations of Europe and politics, largely ignoring cultural influences on society and politics, instead focusing on the Common Market and political ideologies. In terms of society, this article focuses on press readership and the market each publication was looking to influence (working class vs. affluent). This is not confined to British perspectives, however. Helen Parr's *Saving the Community: The French Response to Britain's Second EEC Application in 1967* (2006) gives a thorough examination of French attitudes towards British membership, yet only focuses on France's goal to remain the key leader in the community. There is no mention of cultural or societal attitudes towards Europe and Britain, indicating the gaps in research are not limited to publications from a British perspective.

As mentioned earlier, the majority of texts pertaining to this period examined the political ideologies and impacts of British membership to the Common Market, although there were few texts focused on the cultural aspects of Britain joining Europe. Arthur Marwick is often found in literature discussing this period in British history, and as such has several examples of work relating to culture and society in Britain following the Second World War. Most notable is Marwick's *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, c. 1958-1974* (1998) which discusses the cultural revolution that virtually touched every aspect of Britain during this decade. *The Sixties* is a mammoth undertaking attempting to explore, define, and make sense of the characteristics of a unique era and explores how the waves of innovation and technology, along with rapid transformations to lifestyles, personal freedoms, and identity shaped the Sixties. Marwick's analysis of this era includes the formation of new subcultures and movements—including the New Left, civil rights, gay and feminist movements, amongst many others—and the impacts

they had on shaping politics and society. A response to this was the unprecedented influence of a youth subculture which had a noticeable impact on society seen in their dictating tastes on music, fashion, and popular culture. This of course had an impact on politics, as found in a more liberal presence within institutions of authority, conversations around sex and sexuality, the sanctity of marriage, and social, racial, and class relationships. These developments in society, along with improvements to material life and technology, points to this decade as being one of the more significant and transformational of the twentieth century through its comparisons between Britain, France, Italy, and the United States; and provides a strong analysis of how culture, society, and global politics mix and intertwined.

One of the more recent publications that focuses heavily on Britain's politics in the years leading to the 1975 referendum on European Membership is Robert Saunders' 2018 book *Yes to Europe! The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*. This book is an exploration of Britain in the 1960s and 1970s, discussing both political and cultural shifts in the nation, providing explanations as to why Britain wanted to join the Common Market and exploring countercurrents within politics and society that viewed British membership of the Common Market with skepticism. There are elements of cultural change found within Saunders' analysis, especially in chapter nine, "The New British Empire", which discusses how imperial nostalgia, discontent over the loss of empire and viewing membership of the Common Market as a replacement Empire affected the psyche of leading political campaigners, on both sides of the argument, and how it shaped their political rhetoric leading up to the 1975 referendum. Saunders' acknowledged that anyone who was eligible to vote in the 1975 referendum would have witnessed and understood the rapid pace of decolonization and the loss of empire, and that the open questioning of Britain's place in the world also contributed to how Wales and Scotland functioned within the Union. This is an important aspect of Sanders' work, which is often not discussed in great depth. Saunders' analysis on Wales and Scotland (and Northern Ireland, in particular during The Troubles) and how both nations interpreted what Britain's membership to the EEC would mean for their nation, and how they responded to these questions.

The notion of Wales and Scotland responding differently from England to European Membership is a topic that is also explored in *The Scottish Sixties: Reading, Rebellion, Revolution?* by Eleanor Bell and Linda Gunn (2013). With the opening line asking, "Was Scotland indeed too cold for the flower people?", this text looks at Scotland's interpretations of Swinging London and Carnaby Street in the Sixties. This is not to blend 1960s

counterculture and youth within Britain and her relations with the EEC, but instead it highlights how Scottish culture developed at a different rate to that of the more fashionable London, and how Scotland's cultural development contributed to her own views on the Common Market, and if membership was the best decision for Scotland. This viewpoint helps build into the argument that British membership of the EEC was more than simply a political one. An understanding of Scotland's culture during this period can be found in *The Scottish Sixties,* which is an anthology of several smaller essays touching on many aspects of Scottish life during the period in which Britain was applying for membership of the Common Market. Areas of focus within this anthology include trends in literature and publishing, which it is suggested assisted in shaping cultural debates. Readers are presented with the opinion that while Britain may have been trying to join Europe politically, nations such as Scotland were also attempting to revive and identify their own heritage. Literature discussing the role of culture and how it was affected by politics, as mentioned earlier, is not the dominant trend when it comes to discussing this period in British history.

Occurring in this period is decolonization and the loss of empire. Decolonization across the British Empire and the transition towards the Commonwealth of Nations had a noticeable impact and influence on politics of the 1950s and 1960s. Discussions around decolonization can be found by John W. Young in *The Labour Party: 1964-1970, International Policy, Volume 2* (2003), where Young discusses the impact of Suez, decolonization and loss of empire across the African and Caribbean colonies, and political attitudes towards the EEC. Young also explores decolonization and its impact on British politics and society in *International Relations since 1945* (2013), particularly in part one section three, "Empire, Cold War, and Decolonization: 1945-1953), covering the period of Indian independence and immediate, post-war independence for some of Britain's colonial territories.

Intersections of decolonization and culture can also be found, notably when discussing the impact of decolonization on immigration to Britain in the post-war years. Kennetta Hammond Perry's text *Black Britons, Citizenship, and the Politics of Race* (2015) provides an interesting discussion on the "Windrush Politics" of the late 1940s and 1950s where immigration from the Caribbean was seen as a solution to the labor shortages across Britain. Deemed "citizens of the British Empire", black immigrants faced racial injustices and a lack of acceptance into society, as discussed in the first two chapters of this book: "Race, Empire, and the Formation of Black Britain" and "Migration, Citizenship, and the Boundaries

of Belonging". Other recent texts that explore race in post-war Britain include Amanda Gentleman's *The Windrush Betrayal: Exposing the Hostile Environment* (2020), which while discussing contemporary 21st Century politics, also provides some historical context; and *Black and British: A Forgotten History*, by David Olusoga (2020), exploring the relationship between Britain and African immigrants. These books focus heavily on the relationship between race, identity, and also society.

There are also works which discuss the arts in Britain in the Sixties, including *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties* by Robert Hewison (1986). He argues that in fact, the Sixties began in 1963 and ended in 1975; and this era saw prosperity and failure, both economically and artistically. Hewison also makes many comparisons between pop art and society, using pop art as a metaphor for the decade. Another text that provides insight into the cultural aspect of this period is *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure* by Bart Moore-Gilbert (1994, with later additions). In this text, Moore-Gilbert argues about numerous societal influences that affected the arts, culture, and national identity (and in return, a national culture). Unsurprisingly, clashes in Conservative and Labour politics, Europe, and the Commonwealth are listed in the beginning as heavily contributing factors in cultural decline. But Moore-Gilbert also cites race relations, gender and sexual equality, and rapid independence from former colonies as also affecting arts and culture.

Angela Bartie's text *The Edinburgh Festivals: Culture and Society in Post-War Britain* (2013) explores the cultural policies and politics of art and culture in Edinburgh post-1945. Bartie's text is a good example of how religion, culture, and nationalism merged and shaped the cultural and economic fabric of post-war Edinburgh, using the Edinburgh Festival and The Fringe to show cultural conflict. Bartie is in a similar vein as Hewison's *Too Much* and explores both the societal influences on the Edinburgh festivals, but also how the festivals affected Edinburgh society in the 1950s and 1960s.

An important text that explores the role of cultural policies and the arts in Britain, along with Hewison, is Geoff Mulgan and Ken Worpole's *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning? From arts to industry: new forms of cultural policy* (1986), which discusses the politicization of art and culture, notably by Labour, in the 1950s-80s. Critical and analytical in their research and presentation, Mulgan and Worpole discuss Labour's attempt to create a "civic" culture—using the Festival of Britain as an example—but argue that in focusing on lecture series and intellectual aspects of the arts, Labour ignored the engaging and

"pleasures" of Saturday night cultures. The authors argue that Labour and their understanding and use of the Arts Council, and focus on their own political aspirations, lost the plot on the role of the arts. This text provides a good understanding on the role of local governments and arts and culture.

But perhaps the more significant influences in culture and society in the 1970s was the embrace of nostalgia. The Queen's Silver Jubilee in 1977 was a celebration of Monarchy and nostalgia for the former empire, and successes with shows like *Upstairs, Downstairs* and *Brideshead: Revisited,* and books set before the decline of the Empire, such as Edith Holden's *The Country Diary of an Edwardian Lady* all embrace nostalgia and the longing of days past. In later decades, heritage cinema would capitalize on this; but in the 1970s this new emergence was a reflection on the current state of Britain: the present is less than ideal, and the previous decades were Britain's golden years. Along with nostalgia, Moore-Gilbert cites government-introduced measures to promote local culture and heritage. By looking at increases in local arts centers, we see that the cultural aspects of the 1970s, at least according to Moore-Gilbert, included a revival in local cultural and heritage—and paired with the Queen's Silver Jubilee, a return to "British" culture, which suggests a noticed contrast to the vibrant culture of the Sixties discussed by Hewison. The shift away from artistic trends celebrating Pop Art in the 1970s, as evidenced by the Arts Council's transition to support of more traditional artistic expressions, leads to interpretation that a wave of nostalgic infatuation was a reaction to the Pop Sixties. A cult of nostalgia can also be found in the relationship with the arts and conservation, notably under the guidance of the National Trust and yet there is a noticeable lack in texts relating to the role of the National Trust that are academic and discursive, with most texts on the National Trust being more sycophantic or relishing in bygone eras. While the National Trust has succeeding in preserving the nation's artistic heritage, the lack of literature around this is another noticed gap.

Discussions around nostalgia flowing through the 1950s and 1970s contrasts sharply with discussions focusing on modernity in the 1950s. A text that examines the role of modernity in post-war Britain is a collection of essays, *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain 1945-1965,* edited by Becky Conekin, Frank Mort, and Chris Waters (1999). This anthology arose from an earlier conference relating to modernity in post-war Britain and provides several varying accounts and discussions on the definition of and role of modernity and modernization within between Atlee and Wilson's governments. However, this anthology is flawed in the sense that many of the essays fail to provide any real or solid

theoretical position, and as such, the reader is left with a muddled discussion on how modernity shaped Britain in this period. There are, however, useful discussions with explore the impact of modernity on British culture, such as Americanization of society and popular culture, Conservative and Labour party politics, and successes in modernization as discussed by Conekin on the Festival of Britain, and Peter Mandler on town and urban planning. This text is useful in showing the various interpretations of modernity upon culture and does allow the reader to explore Britain and modernity in economic, social, and cultural arenas.

A question that I asked during these readings was whether culture could be considered influential enough to become a determining factor when it came to discussing British membership of the EEC. In looking at articles that focus more on culture and society of this era, we find little mention of politics. Instead, there is mention of social classes and standing, especially in "From Haughty to Nice: How British Fashion Images Changed from the 1950s to the 1960s" by Becky E Conekin (2010). In this article, Conekin discusses fashion photography as a method for influencing society. Her argument centers around the notion that in the 1960s, London haute couture and mass-produced fashion quickly adapted "the youth cult to mainstream fashion". This was a recognition of the shift in British culture from 1956 to the late 1960s, when Britain was no longer head of an Empire and the welfare state and post Second World War social revolution redesigned class and culture. Conekin attributed this to an increase in education, where local government's education grants provided a source of education for those who normally would not have had the opportunity to do so.[13] Conekin argues that due to an influx in education and government support for developing the arts, new forms of art began to flourish, creating a culture in the late 1960s which fashion embraced and celebrated. Conekin attributes this to accessibility to fashion, noting that once the wealthy and the establishment set the season's looks; but now that clothing is more mass-produced, the older societal rules regarding appearance and clothing are no longer in place, which results in more variety in fashion. Conekin's discussion around fashion, education, and the arts in the 1960s can be interpreted as positive effects of Labour's views towards modernism, which in the 1960s, interpreted modernism as the shift towards a more classless society, with innovation and accessibility as some of the key contributors to this.

---

[13] Conekin here is referring to two things. The first is the Education Act of 1944, spearheaded by RA Butler, which provided free secondary education for all pupils; a similar bill for Scotland followed in 1945. For more, see: HC Deb 19 January 1944 vol 396 cc207-322. Secondly, she is referring to Harold Wilson's appointment of MP Jennie Lee as the first minister of the arts in 1964, who during her tenure, looked to provide funding for local arts programs and support for young and emerging artists.

Whereas Conekin's discussion explores notions of accessibility in the context of education and fashion as an agent of accessibility (reflecting Labour's interpretation of modernism), the concept of accessibility is echoed in another article that focuses on Labour and the Arts Council. In "'Making Britain a Gayer and More Cultivated Country': Wilson, Lee, and the Creative Industries in the 1960s" by Lawrence Black (2006), we return to discussions of Britishness, culture, and heritage. Accessibility in this sense can be interpreted literally to mean access to public heritage, arts, and culture. This article is a discussion on the Labour Government under Wilson, the Department of Education and Science, and public building and works, as well as the arts. A useful argument takes place in 1971, when a new, Conservative government proposed entrance fees into museums and other historical institutions. The Labour Party opposed this, arguing that by introducing fees, museums would become the domain of the elite, and therefore the nation's heritage would be restricted to a select few. The argument of access to heritage and culture takes place numerous times within the late fifties through seventies, but again, it is a concentration on the importance of local and national heritage.

As seen throughout this literature review, many of the available sources tend to focus on British politics and the political project of joining the EEC, but often avoid discussing the possible impacts politics had on cultural policies or how Britain's leading political parties used methods for reframing Britain's global position that also produced changes within the arts and cultural sectors. While there are some publications that do explore the intertwined relationship between politics and culture, such as Hewison's *Too Much* (1986), Mulgan and Worpole's *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning?* (1986), Moore-Gilbert's *The Arts in the 1970s* (1994), and Marwick's *The Sixties* (1998), these texts are now dated and have not been updated or revised. More recent publications that also explore this topic, such as Saunders' *Yes! To Europe* (2018), have elements of the relationship between culture and politics but it is not the intended focus or main research question. This reveals another gap in the research. There are some sources that focus on culture and politics as being intertwined, yet many publications instead choose one or the other as their main focus. The results of this review allowed for the formation of this study's research questions and methodology, which will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

1.3: Methodology

The literature review revealed sources focusing on British politics and the political project of joining the EEC but also showed numerous gaps in research that examined the impact politics had on cultural policy and vice versa. Whilst compiling the literature needed to begin this study, common themes emerged within the scope of research. These themes were: politics (which includes nationalist politics, i.e., Wales, Scotland), popular culture, national identity, and youth culture. From this understanding, I was able to establish my own framework and approach to this study, to best answer my research questions. Areas to avoid were the already-saturated discussions on politics and identity. The themes used within this thesis are: politicized culture, heritage and the arts, nostalgia, along with very minor discussions on identity.

As the literature review showed, there is a considerable lack of discussion about cultural policy and the impact of politics upon it. There is an immense amount of material relating to this period, in the form of government documents, ephemera, and period interviews, political diaries, and memoirs; this material was approached from a fresh viewpoint of cultural policy and the arts. By choosing to focus on government documents relating to government-sponsored events (such as cultural festivals and national exhibitions) it was possible to see evidence of cultural policy in action, and then search for commentaries on these events in the popular press. In exploring the types of exhibitions art galleries and museums were hosting to see if there were political coincidences, and popular culture (literature, film) that picked up on these themes to show a wider public acceptance; there was the opportunity to ascertain how these government-sponsored cultural events related to wider discussions, such as the loss of empire, turn towards Europe, and governmental policies relating to themes of modernization. Drawing upon a wide range of scholarly texts discussing events such as: The Festival of Britain, the Common Market, and decolonization, or themes like cosmopolitanism, as the foundation for this study, originality was able to be found by approaching these secondary sources in the context of art and culture, instead of politics and decision-making.

Building upon a variety of secondary materials was the use of archives. Many of the archives used are well-known, such as the Labour Party Archives, the British Newspaper Archive, or the National Archives. Within these archives, documents relating to events such as the Commonwealth Arts Festival, Festival of Britain, and Fanfare for Europe were used

and, like the secondary sources, were approached under a new vision of cultural policy and arts. These documents were read and interpreted in the same mindset that helped create the research questions for this study. Drawing upon my professional experience within museums and heritage, documents relating to arts policies, cultural festivals, and museum loans and exhibitions were read with an understanding of what was hoped to be achieved by these events, and less of what the actual outcome of these events were. Documents that were consulted heavily were notes, meeting minutes, and correspondences that occurred during the planning stage of festivals and museum exhibitions. It was more important to read these documents within the mindset of the event planners and committee members, to try and understand what the intended outcomes were hoped to be—what the planners wanted to achieve from the event—and then use this interpretation within the discussion around arts, politics, and policies. The use of individual museum archives and art exhibition catalogs, and documents relating to lesser-known events, such as the Festival of Labour, provided the opportunity to see cultural policies in action. Documents relating to CEMA and the Arts Council in Wales and Scotland further added to this discussion around the use of cultural policies and heritage, demonstrating how arts bodies used and developed cultural policies. However, due to the government's response to COVID-19 and forced closure of libraries and museum archives during 13 months of this study's research period, and restricted travel, there are many resources that would ideally have been consulted but were unable to be. These included the Conservative Party Archives in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, which also holds the archives of the personal papers of Edward Heath and Harold Wilson; the Plaid Cymru Archives at the National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth; and the National Library of Scotland, which includes large amounts of archives from the Scottish Arts Council. Many documents within these archives that would have benefitted this thesis were, at the time of research, not digitized and therefore could not be accessed remotely. This disruption of studies also affected access to societies such as British-Italian Society or British-German Society, whose archives and materials would have added to discussions relating to post-war Anglo-European politics and culture. During this period, it was not financially feasible to take a disruption to studies, which resulted in this thesis relying, at points, heavily on research collected prior to government lockdowns, or on digital resources.

The best way to categorize this thesis would be using the descriptors "cultural policy", "art", "society", and "politics". While the emphasis is placed primarily on "cultural policy", "art" and "society"; "politics" is also useful, especially when discussing the roles of the

British government in relation to decolonization, the growth of the Commonwealth, and membership to the EEC.

1.4: Thesis Summary

This thesis is comprised of six further chapters: two chapters providing political and cultural context for this study, three chapters which serve as case studies exploring the research questions listed earlier in the methodology, and a concluding chapter.

Chapter Two, 1945-1975: A Political Context, is structured to provide an overview of the politics, and influences on politics, that helped shape post-war Britain. This includes the conclusion of the Second World War through German War Trials, and explores if Anglo-German relations during this period was affected by lingering attitudes from World War Two. This chapter follows chronologically, and then examines the impact of decolonization, loss of empire and the development of the Commonwealth on British identity and Britain's global presence/influence. The bulk of this chapter explains the politics behind Britain's imperial decline and growth of the Commonwealth, because it is necessary to understand how at times cultural policies were being adapted to respond to current politics. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Britain's political turn towards Europe, explaining why British politics moved away from the Commonwealth and looked at the European Community as a vehicle for economic success and political influence.

Chapter Three, 1945-1975: A Cultural Context, loosely follows the same format as chapter two and explores trends in popular culture during this period. It explores how war memory and German war trials connected into politics and culture. The chapter explores British experiences within wartime, involvement in German war trials in the immediate postwar period, and the popularity of British war films as examples to understand the conflictions with politics and culture. From this, we can understand the cultural affects felt while Britain was refashioning her post-war relationship with former enemies. This organically leads towards a discussion of concepts of nostalgia. Examining the popularity of television shows set during the Edwardian and interwar periods shows that while Britain may have been working politically towards joining the European Community in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and there were cultural policies reflected this goal; there were still popular forms of entertainment and influence in society that longed for a return to pre-war routines. This is contrasted with other parts of popular culture that engaged with cosmopolitanism and globalism, through foreign films and Commonwealth literature, to show that there were

many, varying aspects of popular culture, and how they responded to what was occurring politically in Britain during this period.

Chapter Four, Cultural Policy, CEMA, and the Arts Council, is a broad overview of British cultural policy in England, Wales, and Scotland and examines the origins of an arts policy and explains its evolution. This chapter serves as a foundational chapter in understanding the establishment of a modern arts policy. The time frame for this chapter is slightly different from the main time frame, beginning in 1939. The wartime Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA), established in 1939, set a precedent for the promotion, preservation, and maintenance of the arts and due to its widespread success during the Second World War, it was renamed as the Arts Council in 1946. CEMA, the Arts Council, and the Welsh and Scottish Committees are discussed, looking at how each organization developed policies and exhibitions that reflected their own unique agendas. This chapter shows how cultural policies were developed to reflect various political aspirations, and their successes in doing so. This chapter is essential in understanding the foundation and gradual development of Britain's cultural policies and serves as a springboard for which all subsequent chapters build upon.

Chapter Five, Festivals of Modernity and Culture, builds upon chapter four by further investigating how the Labour Party—and their development of CEMA to the Arts Council— used their understanding of the arts in promoting the Labour Party's interpretations of Modernity Britain. Three Labour supported festivals, the Festival of Britain, the Festival of Labour, and the Commonwealth Arts Festival are discussed, along with the Conservative supported Fanfare for Europe. The four Festivals discussed in this chapter explain the importance of integrating the arts into public policy and decision making and shows how government's priorities could be seen to affect the arts and their societal interactions.

Chapter Six, Exhibitions and Art Galleries, is the final case study in this thesis and discusses the use of art exhibitions and galleries in promoting cultural policies apart from festivals and localized art bodies, such as the Welsh and Scottish Committees. One of the ways this chapter progresses the thesis' questions on how governments used cultural policies to refashion Britain's global presence is by looking at how cultural polices at times reflected the aims of Conservative governments in the 1950s and early 1960s: which was to create a new Anglo-Commonwealth culture as a replacement to empire. This chapter also explains why Commonwealth culture is important to talk about in relation to the European project,

which is often overlooked. This chapter further builds upon the discussions in this thesis due to its exploration on the types of exhibitions that were being shown in Britain and Europe in the late 1960s and 1970s, and also investigates how Britain's heritage sector responded to political aspirations of European membership. This chapter develops the discussion of cultural polices and how they are used by governments, by examining cultural policies that reflect Britain's desire to become a member of the European Economic Community, which shows the transience of arts policies.

The final chapter of this thesis is the conclusion, which will summarize the findings previous chapters/ case studies and will discuss them in relation to the main thesis, demonstrating how the aims of this thesis were met, its contributions to the field, and discussing possible further research and the limitations of this study.

Chapter Two: 1945-1975: A Political Context

Introduction

Despite the focus of this thesis on the development of cultural polices across Britain following the Second World War, it is essential to devote a portion of this thesis to discussing the politics of the era. By beginning this thesis with an overview of the post-war politics that helped shape Britain, the cultural aspects of this period can then be understood. This chapter will add nuance to the thesis, and it will provide an understanding of the types of political forces and ideologies that society and cultural policies were forced to respond to. By providing this political context, the thesis is strengthened. This chapter is constructed chronologically and will begin with an examination of immediate post-war politics that were affected by war memory and German war trials. This is followed by a discussion of decolonization and the loss of empire in the 1950s and 1960s, which resulted in a political transition from Imperial Britain to that of a British Commonwealth. Britain's politics in the 1960s saw a transition from a Commonwealth-based political ideology towards Britain as a member of the European Community, which is the final discussion in this chapter.

2.1: War Memory and German War Trials

German War Trials

Britain's global, political position at the end of the Second World War was that of Allied victor. Widescale decolonization had yet to begin, and the role and development of the Commonwealth was largely beginning to be discussed within a few circles.[14] Britain needed to maintain her position alongside the United States as being one of the world's leaders and following the Allied victories in 1945, British press turned their focus toward the Nuremberg Trials and the war crimes of the Nazi hierarchy. Not only were these trials of global importance and interest, but the British (and American) position within these trials was of prosecutor, which allowed for Britain to retain her position of dominance and influence. Britain's immediate post-war position, paired with her victorious role within the war, would have a profound impact in British diplomacy and cultural policy in the 1950s and 1960s. War memory, German war trials, and Anglo-German relations would impact how arts and culture

---

[14] Speaking at their Conservative Party Conference in October 1948, Winston Churchill spoke of Britain being "at the very point of junction of 'three great circles among the free nations and democracies', 'the British Commonwealth and Empire', 'the English-speaking world', and a 'United Europe'." Alex May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73." *The Round Table* 102, no. 1 (January 29, 2013): 29-39. Accessed February 26, 2019. Doi:10.1080/00358533.2013.764082, 29.

intersected with society, and also Britain's aspirations for maintaining political influence in a post-imperial generation. It is important to discuss how, and why, German war trials were reported in Britain because it shows a cultural shift through discussions around who to hold accountable for the conflict, with new debates on individual responsibility vs. blaming Germany as a whole (as seen when compared to the aftermath of the First World War), which in return would help build skepticism and unease with Anglo-German relations, especially when reforming Britain's relations with former wartime enemies in the 1950s and 1960s. The coverage of British perspective on the war trials also assists with the rapid repackaging of the Second World War in British popular culture in the 1950s and onwards, which is discussed later in this thesis.

Recent literature has explored the British perspective on Nuremberg Trials and other trials pertaining to war crimes. Donald Bloxham argues that "British perceptions of Nazi criminality were shaped, and remained so for decades, by the institutions that British troops encountered as they occupied German territory."[15] Bloxham compares American experiences of Nazi war crimes with those encountered by the British, and also comments that the press reporting of Nazi atrocities was shaped heavily by politics. Bloxham comments that there was a noticed silence in the reporting of liberated concentration camps within Britain and that this was possibly an intentional decision, with some British politicians conscious of the notion that in reporting the treatment of Jewish populations and citizens, that it could appear that Britain was involved in World War Two solely due to the Nazis' crimes towards religion. Bloxham suggests that because American journalists were reporting that true nature of the final solution and Nazi war crimes, Nuremberg was shaped by the differing political views and experiences of France, Great Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union.[16]

---

[15]Donald Bloxham, "Genocide on Trial: Law and Collective Memory" In *The Nuremberg Trials: International Criminal Law Since 1945: 60th Anniversary International Conference,* edited by Herbert R. Reginbogin and Christoph Safferling, 73-85. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110944846.73, 77.

[16] For more on how British and American press reported the holocaust, refer to the following books: Yosef Gorny, *The Jewish Press and the Holocaust, 1939–1945: Palestine, Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union* (2012). This book primarily focuses on the reporting of the Holocaust in Hebrew press in Palestine and Yiddish publications in American-Jewish newspapers, and while is skewed in its coverage, it does give insight to how the Jewish community was reporting the Holocaust, and also includes some British and Soviet publications. Also see: *Why didn't the press shout? American and International journalism during the Holocaust*, ed. Robert Moses Shapiro (2003), which examines press coverage in the USA, Britain, the Soviet Union, Italy, and Nazi Germany, and also territories under Nazi occupation, and argues that the lack of coverage on the Holocaust is one of the largest journalist failures in the 20th Century. See also: Laurel Leff, *Buried by The Times: The Holocaust and America's most important newspaper* (2005) which demonstrates that while The Times did cover the Holocaust, and wartime readers could have been made aware of the atrocities,

This concept is also discussed by David Cesarani, who argues that the British perspective of the Nuremberg Trials, and the decision on who to hold accountable and prosecute, was also shaped by a feeling that unlike most European countries involved in the War and trials, Britain did not have lingering memories of occupation, collaboration, or defeat that would contribute towards forming their views on Germany.[17] Cesarani states that initially, the pressure to try German war criminals originated from European governments-in-exile who were based in London during the beginning of the war.[18] Debates occurring during wartime on who to hold accountable continued in 1942, when the Foreign Office rejected efforts by Jewish organizations to acknowledge and seek action against the treatment of European Jews, and attributed this to the fear that, as the War was still ongoing, there could be retaliatory strikes against Allied POWs. Also in 1942, the War Cabinet was divided on how to enforce or interpret administrative justice, with the Leader of the House of Commons favoring trials against top political and military leaders as well as middle and lower-level ranks; whereas the Lord Chancellor felt that subjecting the common soldier—who was just following orders—to a trial should be out of the question. This thinking changed in 1945, when it was revealed in a Royal Warrant that British courts would be trying those who committed crimes against Allied and British nationals only, requiring Germany to hold Germans to account for the murder of nationals under German territory (including occupation) by the German government.[19] However, this decision was not fully accepted by American politicians and eventually, following the end of the War and a new British Labour Government in office, British perspectives aligned with American perspectives and the Nuremberg Trials commenced. What this shows is, while Britain's role in the Nuremberg Trials is now celebrated in British memory of the Second World War, there was never a definitive direction on who to hold accountable and put on trial for Nazi war crimes. This, along with the press reporting of the war trials, suggests that for many, there was some discomfort in deciding who to blame, and also, for which reasons blame could be asserted. This could also affect the direction of British politics with Germany in the immediate post-

---

the news articles often were delegated to the back of the newspaper, away from the main headlines and top news stories, and therefore were hard to find.

[17] David Cesarani, "The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg: British Perspectives" in *The Nuremberg Trials: International Criminal Law Since 1945: 60th Anniversary International Conference,* edited by Herbert R. Reginbogin and Christoph Safferling, 73-85. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110944846.31, 31. Britain of course suffered during the Blitz and other bombings, but unlike France, the Netherlands, etc.; for many, there were no first-hand experiences of life under the German war machine.

[18] Cesarani, "British Perspectives", 32.

[19] Cesarani, "British Perspectives", 33-35.

war period. We see this when looking at various press commentaries on war trials in the late 1940s and 1950s.

The Nuremberg Trials in the immediate post-war 1940s would see headlines focusing on German war trials and crime. However following Nuremberg, the press was a bit more complex in their reporting of this topic. Of course, notable trials such as Adolf Eichmann in 1961 made headlines, but following Nuremberg's conclusion in 1946, many "minor" trials were held in the countries where the atrocities happened, and because these trials were held on an individual basis, the trials were not widely reported. British press focused heavily on the trials of the Nazi hierarchy at Nuremberg and the trials of a few notable figures in the 1950s and 1960s; but the press largely ignored the trials that did not take place on British soil (West German trials would be somewhat of an exception). As with the Nuremberg Trials, which exposed the mechanisms behind the planning and implementation of the Nazi regime, other trials such as the Luneburg trials, which operated under a British military court in 1945, were reported by the press as a reckoning for Germany as whole, and also unveiled the darkest depths of the regime. In a press clipping from November 1945, the *Belfast News-Letter* reported that "Although revelations of what went on in the concentration camps shocked the civilized world", there were large portions of German society that "seemed to see little or no shame".[20] This is somewhat contradicted upon later in this article, with the statement that many of the camp officials, the men and women who were in charge of the camps in various forms, "were merely following out the orders from the higher authorities—doing, in fact, what they were bound to do, save at the cost of severe punishment."[21] An interesting aspect of this article is found in the identification of one of the key issues that would shape an understanding of the war trials: who to prosecute, but also who to blame. Aside from the major Nazi leaders, such as Hermann Goring, Hans Frank, and Joachim von Ribbentrop, many of the minor trials focused on the camp guards, German military leaders, and soldiers—the nameless faces who both enabled the regime but also viewed their actions as simply following orders. This ties into earlier conversations in 1942 about whether or not British courts should try the common solider.

In the late 1940s, following the completion of the Nuremberg trials, press attention shifted towards the war trials involving German military leaders who were not considered part of the Nazi hierarchy. News clippings from October 1947 announced that imprisoned

---

[20]"War Crimes." *Belfast News-Letter*, 17 November 1945.
[21] "War Crimes." *Belfast News-Letter*, 17 November 1945.

Nazi generals were classified simply as "members of criminal organizations", and that they would be flown back to Germany for further trials.[22] Another similar article from August 1947 commented on the treatment of elderly German generals—those who had been career military figures—and had served in the First World War and earlier conflicts, and the sympathy towards these figures; examples of whom could be found in all military branches across the Allied nations. While the article discusses the good hospital conditions these generals received, they also regularly reminded readers that these were not the average Nazi leader. Statements such as "a professional soldier since 1906", "Because of his strong opposition to Nazism he was twice purged from the German army" and the sweet sentiments "he was known as Papa" whilst being in imprisonment and "he was known as a father to all his troops" all encourage the reader to feel sympathy towards the "common" military figure.[23] This suggests that while the public was supportive of persecuting the Nazi hierarchy to the highest degree, there was a sense of sympathy for the German soldier that was simply doing their job; something that could be argued of all British and European militaries. This only added to the confusion around who to prosecute or blame for the global conflict.

Newspaper articles in the 1950s that discussed war trials reflect this confusion, due to the tendency to focus on the larger, high-powered Nazis, and less on the average solider, due to more sympathetic attitudes. The transition in views can be seen when looking at how the press reported the war trials throughout the proceeding years. An article from February 1951 comments that "Will you bear in mind that any reduction in the sentences of Nazi war criminals is not only morally wrong but a political act of grave implications...?"[24] If we contrast this with articles from the 1960s, we see a sharp contrast in changes in attitudes. A newspaper clipping from January 1960 announced that it was the "final round up of twenty Nazi war criminals", commenting that if they were not brought to trial now, they "probably would not be tried at all."[25] If we further contrast this January 1960 article with an article from October 1968 entitled "Living in Hitler's Shadow", we see an even further shift towards reconciliation and moving on from the Second World War. In the latter article, it argues that

---

[22] "Nazi Generals Sent Home for War Crimes Trial". *Belfast Telegraph*, 7 October 1947.

[23] "German Generals for Trial", *The Scotsman*, 28 August 1947. This newspaper article discusses the treatment of four elderly and well respected "professional soldiers": Field Marshals von Brauchitsch, von Manstein, von Rundstedt, and Colonel-General Strauss. The selected quotations reflecting the character of the generals refers to all except Strauss, who was the youngest general being detained, at the age of 68. While there is no comment on Stauss's character, we can assume that he was similar to the others he was detained with.

[24] "Britain Not To Free Nazi War Criminals—MP's Are Told", *Daily Mirror*, 8 February 1951.

[25] "Final Round-Up of Nazi War Criminals", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 26 January 1960.

"it is time to stop Nazi war crime trials" as they "tend to revive rather than expunge the Nazi image and a new generation of Germans should be allowed to live free from Hitler's shadow".[26] This suggests that while trials were still occurring, they were becoming less and less of a priority. While these articles are but three examples of news reporting over an almost 20-year period, they do give us an insight towards the shift in opinion on World War Two and who to blame or hold accountable.[27]

This brief overview of British press reactions and coverage of German war trials provides us with an understanding of several things. Firstly, occurring in the late 1940s and the coverage of the larger war trials, the press coverage and reactions reasserts Britain (and America's) dominance and influence in global politics. There can be no misunderstanding that the Allies are the most influential in global politics. During the next few decades as Britain underwent decolonization and the loss of Empire, Britain's influential position in the world would be questioned and discussed but, in the late 1940s, Britain was holding onto her actions within the Second World War as evidence of her power tightly.

Secondly, the coverage of the war trials allowed for a reckoning of the War: who to blame and who to prosecute? The debates around who to prosecute occurred within governments and the press and this marked a cultural transition from the aftermath of earlier wars. Following the First World War, the Treaty of Versailles had laid the blame with Germany and the Kaiser was swiftly exiled to the Netherlands. The Treaty of Versailles is not without its criticisms, and many can argue that the result of the Treaty was the Second World War.[28] The concept of blaming an entity or nation for a conflict is not new, it is rather the norm; but the idea of serious, targeted and individual punishment emerged from the Trials. We see this in the execution and imprisonment of individuals who were viewed as being responsible for the conflict, instead of blaming Germany as a whole. This idea, perhaps, would have allowed for Britain to approach Anglo-German political relations in the 1950s

---

[26] "Living in Hitler's Shadow", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 October 1968.

[27] For a more in-depth account of how the British press, see: Antero Holmila, *Reporting the Holocaust in the British, Swedish and Finnish Press 1945-50* (2011). There are two chapters in this book which explore Britain and its coverage of the Holocaust and Nazi war crime trials. Chapter two, *The British Press Responds to the Liberation of the Concentration Camps* and chapter five, *Responding to the Nazi Crimes: The British Press and the Nuremberg Trial*. Also, located within the Weiner Library, London, are numerous microfilms with press reporting war trials and war crimes, written in English and German. They are a valuable resource for exploring this topic in-depth.

[28] There is neither the space or necessity to discuss the Treaty of Versailles in great detail, for further information on this topic see: Sally Marks, "Mistakes and Myths: The Allies, Germany and the Versailles Treaty, 1918-1921 (2013); Norman Graebrer and Edward Bennett, *The Versailles Treaty and its legacy: The Failure of the Wilsonian Vision* (2011), and *The Kings Depart: The German Revolution and the Treaty of Versailles* (1973).

with an attitude more aligned with "we've made our punishments and now can move on". But as we will see later in this chapter, this was not the case.

Furthermore, the war trials did not force the British public to have a sense of resentment towards Germany in the decades following the Second World War. However, having a sympathetic view towards certain German soldiers does not necessarily link with pro-European ideas. What the trials instead revealed was a range of perceptions on post-war Germany, suggesting that while public views may be either pro-German or indifferent towards Germany; politicians were more skeptical and expressed forms of Germanophobia in their unease towards Germany (and France) becoming dominate political forces in the mid to late 1950s. This is discussed by Evgenios Michail, who explores the changing British perspectives on Germany and how they shifted throughout the post-war twentieth century. Michail argues that when confronted with German unification in 1989, many Britons perceived Germany through stereotypes and notions of Wartime Germany. But he also states that, by 1947, half of those surveyed in Britain had no ill feelings towards Germans, and attributed German economic success post-war to British intervention, asserting British exceptionalism in nation-building. Michail suggests that growing British discontent with Germany during the 1950s and 1960s was instead due to Britain's decline as a world power and the growing strength and influence of the EEC.[29]

And finally, this overview reveals that because the war trials and their coverage continued long into the 1950s and 1960s, for some, the war never really ended. Instead, the coverage of the war trials helped embed the Second World War into the national memory and cultural fabric. This can be seen in the popularity of wartime cinema in the 1950s and 1960s, and also the role of nostalgia in the 1970s; both of which will be discussed in the following chapter of this thesis. The next section of this chapter will explore war memory, to further understand how the impact of the Second World War affected culture, and at times conflicted with politics and cultural policies.

War Memory

The 1950s and 1960s demonstrate a mindset of British politicians trying to have the best of both worlds: membership of the European Community while still maintaining her network of imperial/ Commonwealth connections. Outside of cultural industries, the effects

---

[29] Evgenios Michail, "After The War and After The Wall: British Perspectives on Germany Following 1945 and 1989," *University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History* 3 (2001): pp. 1-12.

of the Second World War remained closely tied to British identity with memory being used as a way to construct a post-war concept of Britishness. Memory, either personal or inherited, has been vital in modern perceptions of 1939-1945; but did war memory affect British views outside of Parliament on membership of the European Community? This section is a study about British collective memory of the Second World War, which in turn had implications for the challenge of winning popular consent for Britain's European membership following the turn towards Europe in the 1960s and 1970s. This section's brief discussion of memory studies will provide the basis for an understanding on the significance of nostalgia and wartime-based films, and how they relate to cultural and arts policies.

When examining the impact of World War Two on the widely shared attitudes and subsequent influence on post-war British culture, it is important to understand the role of memory and its power in shaping attitudes and perceptions. There are three types of memory: the individual, the generational, and the collective.[30] Individual memory is a set of recollections that have been experienced first-hand in the past; irrespective if the memories are accurate or if they even happened at all. These memories are an indicator of how an individual *feels* about a particular moment—and what sort of feelings and emotions are drawn from "remembering" an experience. Generational memories are recollections of the past that are shared by a large group of people. An example of generational memory would be the Kennedy Assassination in 1963, which was a defining moment of many adults in the United States in the Sixties and Seventies. Often, shared societal memories help define a political generation, both providing a sense of identity and a common reference point or something the group can all relate to. Generational memory is not a new concept. In the 1920s, sociologist Karl Mannheim suggested that "generation based on birth date could be used to explain social and political behaviors".[31] In his work "The Sociological Problem of Generations", Mannheim articulates his account of generations as belonging to social and cultural units as opposed to biological units. Mannheim argues that generations are created by a memory of historical events unanimously experienced by those who were at a formative

---

[30] Thomas Berger, "The power of memory and memories of power: the cultural parameters of German foreign policy-making since 1945" in *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, ed. Jan Muller-Werner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 79-80. Much of Berger's discussion is framed around the role of memory and political culture and the formation of policy in a post-war German perspective. As such, many of his examples relate to the impact of the Second World War on German policymaking in the 1950s and include works by thinkers like Andrei Markovits, Simon Reich, Thomas Banchoff, and Gunter Hellmann.

[31] Lucy Noakes and Juliette Pattinson, *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*. (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2013), 27.

age. This results in differing generations remembering or interpreting historical events in a multitude of ways. One of the central distinctions between Mannheim's work is the difference between memories appropriated from earlier generations, and those acquired personally (simply put: if we remember something from our childhood because we were there, or if we "remember" because said event was told to us by a parent or grandparent). Since the 1920s, scholars had argued over this concept but generally accepted this definition of 'generation'; along with Mannheim's assessment that an age cohort was crucial in analyzing political and social crises within the modern era.[32] Meaning that when looking at an era such as the 1940s, you needed to examine the generation as a whole that was born earlier and had matured into adulthood during the period in question. Historians such as Mark Roseman and Anna von der Goltz have recently suggested that "historical events are used…as signposts with which people impose order on their past and link their individual fates with those communities in which they live."[33]

Collective memory differs from these two, because it is not based on a direct experience of a group or individual, but instead of a collectivity as a whole. In a basic form, collective memory can be found in official histories taught in higher education, written accounts produced by academics, and political rhetoric. Whereas generational memories are memories that are shared by a cohort of similar ages, collective memories provide a category of people with a common myth or origin and an identity.[34] An example of this would be a group of people who are united by war memorials, school reunions, families, or people from the same village. This concept is examined by Maurice Halbwachs in *On Collective Memory*, which discusses the social construction of memory as being evoked by unique memories that

---

[32] Karl Mannheim: 1893-1947. A Hungarian-German sociologist, he is credited as being one of the founding fathers of the sociology of knowledge. His work often appears independently and in complied works, such as *The Collective Memory Reader.* For more on Mannheim and collective memory, see: Eds. Jeffery K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, Daniel Levy, *The Collective Memory Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); and also: Sarah Gensburger, "Halbwachs' Studies in Collective Memory: A Founding Text for Contemporary 'Memory Studies'?" *Journal of Classical Sociology* 16, no. 4 (November 2016): 396–413. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X16656268. For more on the role of social memory and works relating to memory studies, see: Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, "Social Memory Studies: From "Collective Memory" to the Historical Sociology of Mnemoic Practices" (1998). While dated, this article is useful in its examination on the origins of social memory studies including early works by Marc Bloch, Karl Mannheim, Maurice Halbwachs, George Herbert Mead and Charles Horton Cooley; but also, more contemporary thinkers such as Pierre Nora and Patrick Hutton, amongst many others. Patrick Hutton's *The Memory Phenomenon in Contemporary Historical Writing: How the Interest in Memory Has Influenced Our Understanding of History* (2016) develops the relationship between history and memory, exploring topics such as commemoration and the effects of trauma on memory, which applies to this thesis's discussion.
[33] Noakes, *British Cultural Memory,* 27-28.
[34] Berger, "The power of memory and memories of power" 79-80.

pertain only to their collectivity. These memories are selective and allow members of the collectivity to shape their own views and modes of behavior. An example of this would be a cohort of women who share memories of being field nurses, or the real-life experiences between upper-middle class families and working-class families.[35]

The concept of generational memories is echoed by academic Marianne Hirsch, who uses the term 'post memory' to refer to "the relationship that the generation after those who witnessed cultural or collective trauma bears to the experiences of those who came before, experiences they 'remember' only by means of stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up."[36] Whereas Mannheim argued that when looking at an event, one must examine the generation that matured during said event to see the implications (so, when looking at the 1940s, Mannheim would examine the generation born in the 1920s, who matured into adults during the Second World War, to see how the War had affected them); Hirsch argues that generations born after a traumatic event can, and often do, inherit the trauma from their parents and grandparents.

One of the more recent publications to discuss the role of memory and culture in Britain following World War Two is *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War*, edited in 2013 by Lucy Noakes and Juliette Pattinson. This book examines the role of memory in shaping identity for those directly affected by the Second World War, how later generations viewed and coped with the conflict; and how the War has formed an integral part of a national imaginary, even in the decades the followed 1945; much like the concept of post memory as discussed by Hirsch arguing that memory and trauma can be inherited by later generations.[37] Noakes and Pattinson argue that there are few historical events that are as

---

[35] Published in 1950, *On Collective Memory* by Maurice Halbwachs, has since been translated from French, and combines sociology with cultural memory. Halbwachs' work is an integral part of understanding how we use our memories to shape our pasts.

[36] This quote is taken from an interview given by Hirsch for Colombia University Press, in relation to her book *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. This interview can be found here: https://cup.columbia.edu/author-interviews/hirsch-generation-postmemory . Her website featuring her work with post memory is: https://www.postmemory.net/

[37] Whilst no longer being updated, the *WW2 People's War* archive provides a wealth of first-hand accounts on life during and after the Second World War. Topics include all aspects of life during this era, from the armed services, civilian life, diaries, and occupation. Of the many subtopics, *The Blitz, End of War 1945,* and *Postwar Years* are among the submissions that focuses on life after the war and memories that have been handed down to the authors. In *The Blitz*, there are submissions from people who were small children during the Blitz, but only remember the war based off of stories told to them by family members; these are all examples of Hirsch's post memory, showing the inheritance of war memory and trauma to those who did not actually experience the conflict or events first-hand. The archive can be found here: http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ww2peopleswar/.

deeply immersed in British culture as the Second World War. Despite the War receding further into the distant past with the wartime generation's passing, it continues to resonate with a lingering and vivid presence in British popular culture; and even those born long after have "memories" of World War Two. Noakes and Pattinson comment that "later generations have acquired a learned historical memory informed by successive narratives conveyed in a range of media, thereby adopting memories as their own"[38] This notion is also discussed by Andrew Gamble in *Developments in British Politics.* Gamble comments that "British political culture since the Second World War has been noticeably more willing to celebrate its military and favor military action than has been the case in most other European states."[39] Gamble expands this further to explain how influential Britain's role during World War Two was in shaping British culture and politics throughout the Twentieth Century. Gamble remarks that Britain's experience in the Second World War "of successfully resisting invasion and occupation and then being part of the victorious coalition against the Axis powers has become the most important single component of a reworked national story, Britain standing alone against impossible odds", stating that the lasting effect of this outcome is that "70 years since it ended, British culture at all levels is still saturated with references to the Second World War. This is not the case anywhere else in Europe apart from Russia."[40] This further connects into the concept of generations and generational memories being handed down from one to the other, as addressed by Hirsch, Noakes and Pattinson. Noakes states that

> "The concept of 'generation' is important in perceptions of the Second World War: people use it to claim membership of imagined communities characterized by respect for, and a sense of obligation to, participants in the Second World War, and to differentiate themselves from others assumed to lack these feelings."[41]

Noakes continued this by saying that "Remembering the Second World War even if one did not live through it, or did so only as a child, has certainly been characteristic of those living in Britain since 1945."[42]

As outlined in this short overview, memory comes in various forms, all of which appear when analyzing popular culture in Britain following the Second World War. Of all the

---

[38] Noakes, *British Cultural Memory*, 21.
[39] Richard Heffernan et al. *Developments in British Politics Ten*. (London: Palgrave, 2016), 12.
[40] Heffernan, *Developments in British Politics*, 12.
[41] Noakes, *British Cultural Memory*, 39.
[42] Noakes, *British Cultural Memory*, 39.

forms of memory briefly discussed, generational memory and post memory is especially important and relevant to this thesis's discussion. In the years immediately following VE Day 1945, while the war may have come to an end, the impact and repercussions of six years at battle was still playing out in British media, policy, and memory. Newspaper headlines may have ceased discussing wartime updates, but simply shifted to reporting war crime trials. The reporting of German war crimes, atrocities, and their trials were made quite public, with much of the late 1940s and 1950s devoting coverage to these trials. The trials would continue to cultivate war memories for the post-war generation. But more importantly, the German war trials and peacetime Anglo-German relations would present challenges to a post-war British culture, with popular culture at times in contrast to the cultural policies of the 1950s-1970s.

2.2: Anglo-German Relations: Politics and Culture

One of the methods used for cultivating an Anglo-European culture following the end of the Second World War was developed across a network of several societies, many of which were influenced heavily by politics. However, of these societies, the majority of them were established in either the 1920s or early 1950s to promote heritage and good relations between Britain and Europe. The dates of their establishment suggest that these were created with the aftermath of global conflict in mind: in many cases, the First World War and Second World War. One of the earlier societies was the Anglo-Swedish Society and Anglo-Norse Society, established in 1918, the Anglo-Dutch Society (originally the Anglo-Batavian Society) in 1920, The Franco-British Society in 1924, and the Anglo-Danish Society also in 1924, which was founded by Queen Alexandra.[43] The goals of these societies was to promote cultural exchange, dialogue, and to strengthen ties both culturally and politically.[44] During the Second World War, some of these organizations were established to restore relations between Britain and Axis nations, such as the British-Italian Society, founded in 1941 as the Friends of Free Italy.[45] The British-Italian Society was established as a direct response to the

---

[43] While the Anglo-Danish Society was established by Queen Alexandra—herself a Danish princess—many of the societies have members of various royal families as their patrons. Britain's Elizabeth II and Denmark's Margarethe II are the patrons of the Anglo-Danish Society, Elizabeth II and Norway's Harold V as patrons of the Anglo-Norse Society, and the late Duke of Edinburgh and Carl Gustaf XVI of Sweden as the Patrons of the Anglo-Swedish Society. While these roles are held by various royals, Queen Alexandra appears to be the only royal to have a direct hand in establishing an Anglo-European society; and today, their roles are largely symbolic and ceremonial.

[44] "About Us." The Anglo-Austrian Society. Accessed April 21, 2020. https://angloaustrian.org.uk/about-us/.

[45] "Our History." British Italian society. Accessed April 21, 2020. https://www.british-italian.org/our-history/.

actions of Mussolini, to "promote the overthrow of a fascist regime and to remind the British people of the true Italy and its deep-rooted friendship with the United Kingdom".[46] The Anglo-Austrian Society, founded in 1944, was created to "interest the British public on the fate of Austria" at the end of the war, and to restore Austrian independence and prevent the spread of Russian influence into Europe.[47] The establishment of these societies during a time of conflict between the two linking nations suggests linking cultural ties to help shape public opinion and perceptions. The development of these multi-national societies helped foster a renewal of good relations and cultural development between Britain and Europe.[48] One of the societies that hoped to directly influence culture and policy was the British-German Association.

Shortly following the end of World War Two, the British-German Association was established in 1951 to promote public education about Germany and her relationship with Britain, and to reshape and develop their relationship and strengthen links.[49] For Anglo-German relations, the years immediately following the Second World War were tumultuous. For the first post-war governments, Germany played a large role in foreign policy. The Attlee Government, in office from 1945 to 1951, was influential in establishing the Welfare State and involvement within United Nations, but also focused heavily on post-war Europe, the onset of the Cold War, and the beginnings of widespread decolonization. Following a new Conservative government under Churchill in 1951, while average British attitudes remained indifferent to British relations with Europe, it would not be correct to say that the governments were totally anti-German, but instead were skeptical of Germany. While negative views held by Parliament towards Germany—if related directly to the Second World War—would be understandable, the continual skepticism would not make sense. What caused these views to persist?[50] As mentioned earlier in the discussion around British perceptions of Germany during the Nuremberg Trials, Evgenios Michail remarks that while Britain initially viewed Germany's rapid reconstruction due to British and American

---

[46] "Our History.", British Italian Society.

[47] "About Us." The Anglo-Austrian Society. Accessed April 21, 2020. https://angloaustrian.org.uk/about-us/.

[48] At the time of this writing, numerous attempts were made to contact these societies to gain access to their archives, to see the types of events that were hosted, and their cultural policies during this period, to see how or if the organisation used their platform to influence or respond to conversations around Germanophobia, address NATO, West Germany, etc. No responses were received, and it appears that their archives are closed to non-members or the public.

[49] "Our Purpose." British-German Association. Accessed April 21, 2020. https://www.britishgermanassociation.org/british-german-association-bga-patron-message/our-purpose/.

[50] Germany in the 1950s refers to West Germany.

intervention as proof of Britain's generosity, he also comments that Germany's progress was not entirely welcomed.[51] Michail comments that Germany's economic progress when contrasted with Britain's long recovery from wartime and austerity, paired with decolonization and the loss of imperial influence which was heighted by the Suez Crisis showed Britain losing her status as an international superpower. Britain's unease about the success of Germany resulted in a reforming of relations between Britain and her former wartime enemies, which for some, was an uncomfortable prospect, if only due to sense of pride and loss.[52] This is supported by Thomas Berger's view that "collective memories are part of the larger political culture of a country", with Anne Deighton's numerous examples of British reluctance to join the EEC as not the most powerful or influential player, but a lesser one, joining long after the EEC's establishment.[53] British political skepticism towards Germany was the result of British politicians feeling like a second-class player to their European counterparts.

If we return briefly to the discussion on the German war crime trials in the late 1940s and 1950s, one in particular helped set the course on Anglo-German relations, both in the public and political sphere. The 1949 trail of Erich von Manstein, who was a career military officer and the foremost commander in Poland and Russia, captivated the public as well as the political sphere. Manstein insisted that regardless of him being an officer in the

---

[51] Michail, "After The War and Before the Wall", 4-5.

[52] Michail comments that after being denied entry twice into the EEC, Britain finally joined by now was faced by Germany who, with a more powerful economy and founding member of the EEC, was actually in a stronger position of influence than Britain was. Michail, "After The War and Before the Wall",5.

[53] Berger, "The power of memory and memories of power", 81.; and Anne Deighton, "The Past in the Present: British Imperial Memories and the European Question" in *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, ed. Jan Muller-Werner, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 111-114. This chapter by Deighton explores Britain's reluctant relationship with Europe, from 1945 until Tony Blair and New Labour. Some of the examples given by Deighton supporting British reluctance to join Europe is between 1948-49, when Britain managed to obtain some influence in European politics with a temporary leadership position. This was seen in the creation of the Brussels Treaty Organization (1948), Council of Europe (1949) and the NATO Treaty of 1949. Yet after France's leadership within Europe after 1950, Britain began to distance themselves and increasingly became a defensive outsider. This is seen in Britain's decision not to take part in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951, which is seen as the first attempt at a supranational experiment. Ruth Wittlinger agrees with Deighton, remarking that memory "plays a key role in the symbolic discourse of politics, in the legitimation of political structures and action, and in the justification of collective behavior." Wittlinger comments that "European integration—originally conceived as a tool to keep Germany might at bay—contributed further to (West) Germany's increasingly significant role on the European stage, giving it another boost of confidence towards Britain. Whereas other West European countries had already associated themselves with (West) Germany fairly soon after the war through the process of European integration, Britain's entry into the European Community in 1973 occurred only very late—arguably a symptom of Britain's reluctance to join Europe's middle-ranking powers on an equal footing." Ruth Wittlinger, "British-German Relations and Collective Memory." *German Politics and Society* 25, no. 3 (Autumn 2007): 42-69. Accessed July 25, 2019. doi:10.3167/gps.2007.250303., 46.

Wehrmacht, he was only following orders and when he did come into contact with orders that he morally disagreed with (one in particular was the order to execute political commissars without a trial), he would disobey the order.[54] This is one of the key sources of contention in the trial. Manstein would argue that as a soldier, he was obligated to obey orders from his superiors; stating "I am a soldier. I always obey charges", later asserting that "the right does not exist for a soldier to disobey orders."[55] Yet Manstein would also argue that he was different from others in his position because he would choose to disobey orders that he disagreed with—such as executions and the enabling of the regime; and he had a consistent vocal opposition towards Hitler. The debate on whether a solider can be charged for simply following orders—whatever these orders are—ensued. One press article even commented that "If Manstein is guilty, so is Churchill."[56] Ultimately, Manstein was sentenced to 18 years in prison, being charged on nine of seventeen war crimes related charges.[57] And while Manstein was released after only four years, this trial would have much larger implications; especially relating to Anglo-German political relations.[58]

In Daniel Cowling's article *Anglo-German Relations After 1945*, Cowling states that the significance behind this trial was that Manstein's persecution, public trial, and imprisonment was highly divisive, and that "as the final war crimes prosecution, encouraged deliberations over Germany's past, present, and future."[59] This is, perhaps the most important thing to take from this case: the sudden consideration of whether or not Germany's past can directly influence her future, politically. Cowling also remarks that much of the public's views towards Germany were rooted in longstanding views of Germanophobia; the public perception of Germany rapidly improved as a result of the Cold War, where West Germany was now our ally and Russia the foe.[60] Politics between Britain and Europe in the mid-1950s

---

[54] "Manstein Pleads Not Guilty to All Charges", *Dundee Evening Telegraph*, 24 August 1949.

[55] "Issue at Manstein Trial: Should a General Disobey Orders?", *Staffordshire Sentinel*, 5 October 1949.

[56] "If Manstein is Guilty, so is Churchill", *Gloucester Citizen*, 23 November 1949.

[57] "Von Manstein Gets 18 Years' Sentence", *Londonderry Sentinel*, 20 December 1949.

[58] "Von Manstein is Released", *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette*, 7 May 1953. This article comments that he had served 8 of his 12-year sentence. Manstein's sentence was reduced from 18 to 12 years in 1950, and also took into consideration his capture and subsequent imprisonment in 1945.

[59] Daniel Cowling, "Anglo–German Relations After 1945." *Journal of Contemporary History* 54, no. 1 (2017): 82–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009417697808, 106.

[60] Cowling, "Anglo-German Relations After 1945", 109. But, how exactly did Germanophobia affect British political attitudes, and did it have a large enough presence to cause alarm for West German rearmament, NATO, and British membership to the European Community? Germanophobia and Britain is the result of numerous factors. One cause of the tense relations between some Britons and Germany is the seeming reversal of fortunes following 1945. Considering that Britain had led the industrial revolution and been the major political force in the 19th Century, being placed on the back foot of economic and military control on the 20th Century affecting the British psyche was seemingly insurmountable. But perhaps the largest factor is

also helps explain aspects of Germanophobia. Alongside decolonization, one of the leading political events to occur in the mid-1950s was NATO and the question around West Germany's membership.

West Germany's accession into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, commonly known as NATO, on May 6, 1955, took place during the midst of European integration and against a backdrop of intensifying East-West relations.[61] This understandably was not without its contentions. In 1951, Princeton University's C.D.G. Onslow published in *World Politics* an essay entitled "West German Rearmament"; in which he discussed the contemporary views on Germany and their future with a military. Onslow comments that "the most consistent feature" of policy towards a "defeated Germany" was the "emphasis on the need for the disarmament and demilitarization of the Germany of the future"; which Onslow remarks was only made more permanent after the establishment of West Germany in 1949.[62] If this was the viewpoint in 1949—that Germany must remain demilitarized—Onslow was quick to point out that by 1951, debates on West German rearmament had begun to feature in both British and American press, which Onslow found as an interesting indicator on public opinion towards Germany.[63] Peter Speiser comments in his book *The British Army of the Rhine: Turning Nazi Enemies into Cold War Partners* that while British occupation of West Germany was criticized by German politicians and press, the majority of ordinary West Germans felt that in 1949, the reestablishment of the German army was "not at present necessary or desirable", further commenting that "a German army would attract young men

---

Germany's wholehearted embrace and economic success across Europe; including West German rearmament and NATO membership. The transition from oppressor to a friendly, co-operative nation with its former enemies triggered resentment across the British political elite, who are often Eurosceptic, as discussed by Cowling (Anglo-German Relations, 109). We see this in the 1950s and early 1960s in Britain's hesitation to acknowledge and join the EEC, as discussed in the beginning of this dissertation. Historian Mark Connelly comments that "Germanophobia is the result of a combination of factors. History is clearly important: twice in the Twentieth Century Britain found itself involved in a total war against Germany." He furthers this by clarifying that "During this same period other nations experienced an equally traumatic relationship with Germany but have not allowed the memory of that experience to affect continually their dealings with modern Germany." With this in mind, we can clearly see the transition from the type of war memory held by the everyday Briton, to a political skepticism, a viewing of Germany as an economic—instead of military— competitor. For many Britons, there was little resentment towards Germany following the Second World War; and that in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the German war trials demonstrated condemnation towards the Nazi regime, not the average German. However, in Whitehall, Germanophobia was dominant. It seems that while British voters had moved on from being anti-German, the Government had not.

[61] NATO, "A Short History of NATO," NATO, accessed January 28, 2022, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/declassified_139339.htm.

[62] C.G.D. Onslow, "West German Rearmament." *World Politics* 3, no. 4 (July 1951): 450–85. https://doi.org/10.2307/2008892, 450.

[63] Onslow, "West German Rearmament", 450-451.

from essential industries, which can ill afford a loss."[64] There were other things to consider, too. Following the Soviet Union's development of nuclear weapons in 1949; Western allies were aware of reality of a nuclear war, considering advancements made by the Russians and the Americans. Western occupation in Germany remained essential both for security and political influence. However, the allied nations were in severe debt from the war, and as Britain and France faced colonial pressures; there soon became an understanding that Germany would need to contribute to her own defense. Both British and American politicians privately discussed rearmament as soon as 1949; but France, with their memories of the 1940-1944 occupation still fresh, refused to consider a militarized Germany.[65] This division across this topic can also be seen in the press.

Press from the early 1950s reflected politics, and too was divided on the topic of West German rearmament and membership to NATO. In an article from 1951, Dublin's *Evening Herald* remarks that "The most difficult problem is Germany. It is thought that Western Europe cannot be made capable of defense without West German rearmament."[66] One comment that is made in this article perhaps sheds some light on the fears of rearmament: "it would be right to arm the West Germans unless this would precipitate a war with Russia."[67] While this conversation was beginning to emerge at the beginning of the Fifties; by 1954 there was considerable discussion on the possible implementation and consequences of West German rearmament. In a newspaper article published in July 1954, Labour politician Aneurin Bevan remarks that a rearmed Germany would be like taking "a decisive step towards a third world war", further stating that an armed Germany would immediately want to create a united Germany, which would assert influence across the West and, could possibly form warm relations with the Soviet Union.[68] Here, we see that a common concern with German rearmament is the possibility of escalating tensions between West and East. Another article from 1954, entitled "French Fears" states that with a "definite British promise to keep armed forces stationed" in Germany and Europe, this would "go very far to remove their [French] fears about admitting West Germany to NATO" and allow rearmament.[69] This is

---

[64] Peter Speiser, *The British Army of the Rhine: Turning Nazi Enemies into Cold War Partners*. (Baltimore: University of Illinois Press, 2016.), 70.

[65] James S. Corum, *Rearming Germany*. (Leiden: BRILL, 2011). Accessed November 5, 2019. ProQuest Ebook Central, 5.

[66] "Critical Years", *Evening Herald (Dublin)*, 15 January 1951.

[67] "Critical Years", *Evening Herald (Dublin)*, 15 January 1951.

[68] "German Rearmament is 'a step towards war'", *Northern Whig*, 24 July 1954.

[69] "French Fears", *Daily Herald*, 30 September 1954.

echoed in another 1954 article in which argues that West German rearmament would produce a "reasonably good chance of preventing Russia from overrunning Europe".[70] While there were still criticisms against a militarized West Germany, a general consensus was forming that unless West Germany was allowed to rearm and join NATO, the West would struggle to contain Soviet influence.

Looking at this small selection of articles, we can see that German rearmament and NATO membership was essential to maintaining a Western Europe that resembled the post-war themes of peace and prosperity. West Germany was the 15th member to join NATO on May 6, 1955; and transitioned into a militarized nation.[71] It makes sense, then, that cultural societies linking Germany with Britain were established shortly after the end of many of the German War Trials. As with the Anglo-European and Anglo-Scandinavian societies established after the First World War, there was a concentrated effort made to create familial links with the nations, many of whom had recently been at war with each other, and sharing culture was seen to be the obvious method for this. Establishing cultural bonds and connections during contentious political periods in peacetime was a method of both integrating cultural policies connecting Britain with Europe, but also, an attempt to connect popular culture with cultural policies. The use of international societies as a possible method of peacekeeping is similar to the notions around town twinning, and academic exchange programs as discussed later in chapter four, because it shows concentrated efforts about making former hostile nations accessible through culture and goodwill, and also by connecting generations which creates friendly bonds through individuals as well as organizations and cities.

This section has explained how the prevalence of German war trials in British press affected, and shaped, Anglo-German relations both in politics and culture. In the late 1940s

---

[70] "West could win—with Germany", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 30 September 1954.

[71] Some articles that go further in depth on Anglo-German relations during this period, along with West German rearmament and German politics are: Searle, "A Very Special Relationship: Basil Liddell Hart, Wehrmacht Generals and the Debate on West German Rearmament, 1945-1953." (1998); Goetz, "British Political Science and the Study of German Politics" (2001); Ludlow, "A Waning Force: The Treasury and British European Policy, 1955-63" (2004). In addition, a file located within the National Archives, PREM 11/3804 discusses German relations and German policy in the early 1960s. Most of the correspondences within this file are between American, British, and German officials, discussing the role of NATO and how a militarized West Germany is essential to protecting Western interests from the Soviet Bloc. Another interesting aspect of Britain's political relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe can be found in Sarah Davies, "The Soft Power Of Anglia: British Cold War Cultural Diplomacy in the USSR." *Contemporary British History* 27, no. 3 (June 2013): 297-323.

and early 1950s, much of Britain's political rhetoric was shaped by her relations with former wartime enemies. At the same time, there were also growing discussions on the future of Britain's empire, and whether or not Britain could maintain her imperial presence. A natural part of this discussion was the role of the Commonwealth of Nations, as well as questions around immigration from parts of the empire which had recently served alongside British soldiers during conflict.

2.3: The London Declaration, 1949

It is important to begin this section of the chapter with an examination and understanding of the development of the Commonwealth, and why this is important to understanding the development and use of cultural policy in the decades following the Second World War. The role of decolonization and the development of the Commonwealth had a profound impact on the cultural policies that the British government enacted during the 1950s and 1960s, and it is therefore necessary to discuss these political events and legislation.

Today, the Commonwealth of Nations is a vast organization reaching into all corners of the globe: 53 members consider themselves part of the Commonwealth, with many of the Commonwealth's members being former imperial territories. The current organization of the Commonwealth is a fairly recent development, however, having only been established in 1949; less than three years before the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, the current Head of the Commonwealth. The origins of the Commonwealth can be traced to the Statue of Westminster in 1931, which recognized the sovereign independence and equality of Britain's dominions: Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Irish Free State, Newfoundland, and South Africa.[72] Following the 1931 Statue, one of the more significant events in the creation of a modern Commonwealth was India's membership of the organization as an independent republic in April 1949.[73] The meeting of Commonwealth Prime Ministers in April 1949 is one of the most significant developments in the foundations of the modern Commonwealth because it established the guidelines for entry and membership into the Commonwealth. This meeting was crucial for several reasons: it laid the framework for nations, many of which had formerly been colonial territories of the Empire, to join the Commonwealth following their

---

[72] *Statute of Westminster, 1931*. Available at https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/22-23/4/contents.
[73] Martin Kitchen, *The British Empire and Commonwealth: A Short History*. (Britain: Macmillan Press LTD, 1996), 143.

own independence; provided classification for citizens' rights; and confirmed the role of the British government and monarchy within a Commonwealth country.

As mentioned, the London Declaration set the guidelines for membership to the Commonwealth, and the role of the British monarch and government. In the case of India's entry, we see that these two points were of extreme importance. Questions were raised on April 25, 1949 about these points, and it was determined that clarification of the title of the King and his role within the Commonwealth was needed.[74] In a meeting with the Commonwealth Prime Ministers on April 28, 1949, it was determined that India received full membership to the Commonwealth of Nations, and her acceptance of the King as symbol of the free association of its independent member nations, and as such, the Head of the Commonwealth. Following this meeting, a press release commenting about the status of India within the Commonwealth was published; and the nations listed as supporting this agreement were Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Ceylon (modern day Sri Lanka), and the United Kingdom.[75]

The fact that the King's title was considered to be one of the more pressing matters of the meeting is an interesting insight into the views held by the His Majesty's Government, and Britain's influence within her former territories. By including the British monarch as Head of the Commonwealth—even in Commonwealth governments and countries that would no longer recognize the monarch as their sovereign or leader—we see that Britain is formally including binding measures to keep the former colonial territories tied to the Empire, or at least a symbolic empire. Signified within the London Declaration was that all members had, at one time or another, been under the jurisdiction of the Crown. And continuing forward, the British monarch would be retained as the leader of the new Commonwealth. Simply put, the declaration "made the king the symbol of the free association of its independent members and as such Head of the Commonwealth."[76] George VI became an unmistakable attribute easing the transition from Empire to Commonwealth. For traditional dominions of the Empire, the

---

[74] TNA DO 35/2209 April 25, 1949: Letter from the United Kingdom Representative to the Republic of Ireland, Dublin to Sir Percivale Liesching: Addressing the necessity to clarify the name for the King, in relation to Commonwealth governments and countries that will no longer recognise the monarch as their sovereign or leader. The idea also arises to use the King as a symbol for the Commonwealth; a unifying figure.

[75] TNA DO 35/2209: Held within this file includes letters from UK Representatives, press releases and official statements, and correspondences.

[76] Ruth Craggs and Harshan Kumarasingham, "Losing an Empire and Building a Role: The Queen, Geopolitics and the Constructions of the Commonwealth Leadership at the Lusaka Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, 1979", *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (2015): vol 43, no 1, 82.

London Declaration meant that their position as realms was unaffected, and overall the Crown retained its symbolic authority within the unique international body. [77]

1949's *The Modern Law Review* remarked that:

> "India's intention to become a 'sovereign independent republic' and to eliminate the Crown from her future constitution was reconciled with her desire to remain a full member of the Commonwealth…to enjoy most of the advantages of membership of the Commonwealth."[78]

The argument and example used to allow India to access the benefits gained through Commonwealth membership was Ireland's (then) membership to the organization. Ireland (Eire) had remained part of the Commonwealth until leaving in 1949 and had shown that a country could be a member without professing allegiance to the Crown; and that India, or any future country, did not need to have a monarchy in order to maintain their links to the United Kingdom, or any other member state. As the years progressed, colonies became sovereign nations and members of the Commonwealth, all linked together under the British monarch, a new symbolic empire of shared culture, and shared ideas.[79]

Titles aside, the rights of the independent nation within the Commonwealth were determined, which concluded that Commonwealth citizens (in this case, India's citizens) also held British citizenship. While the main focus of the April 1949 meeting was to discuss the future of India, it also set precedence for membership of the Commonwealth, as the Prime Ministers in attendance could not have ignored the wave of decolonization and independence movements that were soon to sweep across the fifties and sixties, and the impact this would have on global politics and alliances.[80] The London Declaration was argued to be "one of the great constitutional documents of modern times", due to the inclusion of India as an independent (having no allegiance to the Crown) nation with the advantage of full

---

[77] Craggs and Kumarasingham, "Losing an Empire and Building a Role", 83.

[78] "The London Declaration of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, April 28, 1949", 351.

[79] Queen Elizabeth II succeeded her father as Head of the Commonwealth on her accession to the throne in 1952. During the 2018 Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, held in London in April 2018, members of the Commonwealth agreed that upon her death or abdication, Charles, Prince of Wales would become the third Head of the Commonwealth. The tradition of having a British Monarch as the leader of the Commonwealth continues.

[80] This meeting was attended by Prime Ministers from the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, South Africa, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon; King George VI also partook. Peter Marshall, "The Commonwealth at 60", *The Round Table*, vol. 98, no. 404 (2009), 536.

membership of the Commonwealth.[81] Sometimes overlooked, crucially, *The Modern Law Review* also included one very important statement regarding citizenship: "In English law, moreover, her status was unchanged, and her citizens were still regarded as British subjects."[82] This inclusion of Commonwealth subjects also having right to British citizenship would affect only Indian subjects, and was not extended automatically to all other incoming members of the Commonwealth, which is a bit tricky and relates to another piece of legislation. Occurring only one year prior to the London Declaration, the British Nationality Act 1948 determined the status of British subjects, both at home and abroad, and also had a direct impact in decolonization, the Commonwealth, and rights. The 1948 Act determined that those born within the United Kingdom or her Colonies would be granted British citizenship upon birth, and also noted that one could receive British citizenship by descent— given their father had been born a British citizen under the same guidelines.[83] The 1948 Act is the product of the 1938 Imperial Conference in London. During this conference, South Africa's General Hertzog challenged the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act to confine the meaning of "British subject" to mean "a subject of Great Britain", which would allow Commonwealth states to create their own citizenship laws under the general umbrella of British citizenship.[84] Combining the 1948 British Nationality Act with the 1949 London Declaration, a set of legal guidelines was formed to provide a basis for citizenship and a state's existence within Britain.[85] As decolonization rapidly increased in the Fifties and Sixties, Commonwealth membership, citizenship, and the role of Britain in her former territories became one of the leading political discussions.

The significance of the 1949 London Declaration, along with the 1931 Statue of Westminster, is the birth and development of the Commonwealth, which included

---

[81] S.A de Smith, "The London Declaration of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, April 28, 1949" *The Modern Law Review* 12, no. 3 (1949): 351-354). Accessed February 19, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1090506 , 351.

[82] "The London Declaration of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, April 28, 1949", 351.

[83] *British Nationality Act 1948, c.56.* Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/11-12/56/enacted.

[84] E.C.S. Wade, "British Nationality Act, 1948". *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law* 30, no. 3/4 (1948): 67-75. Accessed 7 February 2020. https://www.jstor.org/stable/754289.

[85] Ian R.G. Spencer's book *British Immigration Policy since 1939: The Making of Multi-Racial Britain* (1997) also has a discussion on the impact, and the initial necessity, of the 1948 Nationality Act. Spencer argues that the Act in no active sense contributed to the flow of British subjects into the United Kingdom; and that due to Canada creating their own immigration laws in 1946, and the independence of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon in 1947, who also introduced their own laws; Britain needed to define their citizenship also. Spencer also acknowledges that shortly after the 1948 Act was passed, lawmakers were quick to discuss whether or not the Act could be used to curtail or segregate immigration, particularly by black British subjects (54-56).

membership to the organization; as well as discussions around citizenship and identity. The role of the Commonwealth would be a sticking point in British politics and policy for the next two decades.

2.4: Decolonization: The Fifties and Sixties

The next two sections will focus on decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s, and the transition from Empire to Commonwealth. Having discussed the legislation that provided the foundation for the Commonwealth and set forth membership and citizenship, the geopolitics of the era is equally important to understand. This is because during decolonization and the transition from Empire to Commonwealth, the arts policies in the 1950s and 1960s would have a heavy emphasis on integrating Commonwealth culture into British culture.

According to W. David McIntyre in his work *British Decolonization, 1946-1997*, there are six phases to decolonization. These are:

- o The Dominion Status, beginning in the Nineteenth Century and lasting until the Statue of Westminster in 1931;
- o 1947-48: The Attlee Government's granting of independence to India, Pakistan, Burma (Myanmar), and Ceylon (Sri Lanka); ending the Palestine Mandate (Mandatory Palestine, 1920-48), and planning an end to Indirect Rule in Africa;
- o Churchill and Eden's Governments in the Fifties: Central Africa and the West Indies, including independence for Sudan, the Gold Coast (Ghana), Malaya; and considering incorporating Malta into Britain;
- o Macmillan's Government and the "Winds of Change", 1957-63: furthered African independence and Cyprus;
- o Wilson's Government and ending "East of Suez" in 1967: withdrawal from the Gulf States, Aden and Yemen, and the Far East (except Hong Kong and Brunei);
- o 1970s and 1980s: The Pacific islands, Caribbean islands, and Zimbabwe. What remained: The Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong (receiving independence in 1997).[86]

---

[86] W. David McIntyre, *British Decolonization, 1946-1997.* (London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1998), 11-12.

While noting that this timeline is now dated, it can serve as a good reference point for understanding the various phases of decolonization that Britain experienced during the latter Twentieth Century. While not confined to the 1950s and 1960s, it was during this period that the majority of the Empire gained independence.

Following the Second World War, British policy makers sought to frame their foreign policy around three areas of focus, dubbed the "Three Circles: The Commonwealth, the United States, and Western Europe."[87] Speaking at the Conservative Party Conference in October 1948, Winston Churchill spoke of Britain being "at the very point of junction of 'three great circles among the free nations and democracies', 'the British Commonwealth and Empire', 'the English-speaking world', and a 'United Europe'."[88] In the late 1940s and early 1950s, politicians would have argued that the Commonwealth "had the foremost claim" in its priorities. Indeed, few Britons could forget that after the fall of France in 1940 it was not Britain alone, but Britain, her Empire and the Commonwealth, which stood against the all-conquering forces of the Nazi dictatorship. This nostalgic sentiment aside, it was felt that "Britain's leadership of the empire and Commonwealth was believed to be crucially important to its global role."[89] When the term "superpower" was coined in 1944 by William T Fox[90], it was largely assumed that Britain, its Empire and Commonwealth, was one of the three superpowers. [91] Because of this, the political focus on the Commonwealth makes sense.[92] At the start of the 1950s, the Empire was largely intact, and while there was growing disconnect and enhanced mutterings of colonial independence, for the most part, His

[87] Alex May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73." *The Round Table* 102, no. 1 (January 29, 2013): 29-39. Accessed February 26, 2019. Doi:10.1080/00358533.2013.764082, abstract.

[88] May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe", 29.

[89] May, "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe", 30.

[90] William T Fox, 1912-1988, was a professor at Columbia University specializing in foreign policy and international relations. Fox published numerous books and articles but is perhaps best known for 1944's "The Super-Powers". He was also the director of Columbia's Institute of War and Peace Studies.

[91] "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73", 30.

[92] In the Forties, His Majesty's Conservative Government were facing pressures from both international and African communities to end their colonial policies. When the Atlantic Charter was signed in August 1941, it expressed "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live". And while this statement was drafted while Europe was falling to Nazi occupation; perhaps due to concerns that Britain would attempt to regain their lost territories and dominions, The Atlantic Charter provided radical interpretation. Whereas American President Franklin Roosevelt held suspicions that Britain would take back control of their Japanese-occupied colonies; Churchill interpreted the Charter as only applying to European countries under German occupation. The Second World War saw Britain and her colonial forces taking arms together; and following the allied victory, it became obvious to both the colonizer and the colonized that WWII had given the need for a redefinition of their political collaborations.

For more on this, see: Kevin O'Sullivan, "'Winds of Change': Decolonisation in British West Africa." *History Ireland* 4, no. 14 (July/August 2006): 40-45. www.jstor.org/stable/27725487.

Majesty's Government focused more on retaining and strengthening post-war relations within the Commonwealth, which included trade.

Prior to Britain's applications for European membership, trade consisted mostly with members of the Commonwealth, which both Britain and members of the Commonwealth relied on. This relationship was tested in the early Sixties, when Britain switched their political focus towards Europe, effectively leaving their Commonwealth brethren behind. In July 1960, the Macmillan government noted that Britain must make concessions with the Commonwealth in order to gain membership with the EEC, but that they could not risk their Commonwealth relationship. It was understood that "full membership [of the EEC] should be considered but special terms must be sought to meet Britain's fundamental interests and those of the Commonwealth." [93] Yet by June 1961, the British President of the Board of Trade stated that: "Commonwealth Governments should be warned that, even if we did not join the Community, it was likely that our existing policies, which gave unlimited access to Commonwealth products, will need to be modified."[94] This change in relationship is not unique to trade but also to culture, as we'll see later in more detail.

With numerous links between Egypt, Suez, and African colonies, these territories would have a large impact on British identity and her connections to imperialism.[95] After the Suez Crisis ended in 1957; Britain could politically "no longer wield the big stick; she had to rely on cunning, diplomacy, and public relations."[96] The events surrounding Suez showed the global political arena that Britain was no longer a major superpower, and that they could not

---

[93] George D. Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire, 1775-1997.* (London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1999), 190.

[94] Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire,* 190.

[95] By the end of the Second World War, the British Empire was at its highest; yet with India's independence in 1947, a tide of nationalism spread across Africa. However, it was the tension between Britain and Egypt that was the most pressing matter when a Conservative government returned to power in 1951. During the premiership of Anthony Eden, we begin to see a surge in independence movements and decolonisation; with no coincidence that the Suez Canal Crisis occurred under the leadership of Eden. In brief, the Suez Canal Crisis was the culmination of tension between Egypt and the Anglo-French controlled Suez Canal. Since 1888 and the Constantinople Convention, the Suez Canal had been viewed as a strategically important location (access to nearby oil fields added to this), and the decision was taken that regardless of periods of war or peace, the canal would be accessible by any vessel, irrespective of their nationality (see: "Convention Respecting the Free Navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal", *The American Journal of International Law* (1909) 123-128.) When, in 1956 Egyptian leader Colonel Nasser nationalised the canal, leaders were furious over a land grab, and what was also viewed as a seizure of power. A plan was hatched—known as the Sevres Protocol—where Israel would attack Egypt, and France and Britain would invade, all under the guise of peace-making and a return to order. Of course, the plans backfired, and it emerged that Eden, France, and Israel had concocted this elaborate rouse to regain control. But significantly, it also emerged that Eden had lied to Parliament and the Monarch; and in January 1957 he resigned in disgrace, citing ill health.

[96] Kitchen, *The British Empire and Commonwealth,* 125.

play at the same level as the United States, the United Nations, and the USSR. For the colonial territories still under the Empire, this of course was a signifier that Britain was losing control, and their push for independence would not have as strong of a resistance as it may have before the Second World War. Due to the highlighted weakness in British policy Suez shed light on, and what can only be described as a "political watershed moment" which led to the removal of "vestiges of Britain's imperial statehood, a diminishing pride in the Commonwealth…"; the Suez Crisis can be seen as a moment where Britain was finally and rapidly losing its grasp on their Empire—and where it was noticed.[97]

The impact of Suez on British identity cannot be ignored. Having used Empire and Britain's victory in World War Two to fashion an identity based off Britain having a positive global presence—to have Suez deal such a publicly embarrassing hand was a crushing blow to what Britishness meant. Suez made Britons realize that without approval from the UN or United States, she could not influence global politics, and that her days of enforcing order across the globe was finished. The Queen was now head of a smaller island nation, not the widespread Empire that Victoria—and even her father—oversaw. The national sentiment was greatly affected because Suez had confirmed that with the growing decolonization, British influence and seemingly respectability was waning.[98] No longer did "Britain" represent control, power, or position, or superiority. Suez also occurs only months before the establishment of the EEC, again confirming that Britain was no longer the leading political force. This great blow to the British establishment and national identity combined with colonial discontent caused a reimagining of Britishness. In chapter three, there will be a discussion on the popularity of British war films during the 1950s and 1960s and how films

---

[97] "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73", 30.

[98] For an interesting perspective on how the Suez Crisis was found in literature, see Andrew Hammond's "British Literary Responses to the Suez Crisis"(2013), which examines "the discursive responses to the Suez Crisis in such texts as John Fowles' *Daniel Martin* (1977), Lawrence Durrell's *The Alexandria Quartet* (1957–60) and Olivia Manning's *The Levant Trilogy* (1977–80), analyzing its links to orientalism, anti-Americanism, Cold War hostilities and fears about British national decline. Hammond also explores "multiple ways in which British literature engaged with Cold War history was through its focus on events in the developing world." (53) Hammond argues that "The Suez Crisis was a small conflict by Twentieth Century standards, with casualties of around six thousand soldiers and civilians and a death toll of almost two thousand. Yet its impact on the course of contemporary history has entered Suez in the era's pantheon of 'hot wars' alongside Korea, Malaya, Kenya, Vietnam, Angola, Nicaragua, Afghanistan and many others. It was the humiliation in Egypt, and the 'the blunt fact that Britain could not operate militarily in the Third World in the face of American disapproval', that initiated the nation's full retreat from world leadership. After Eden's resignation in January 1957, his successor Harold Macmillan accepted decolonization in his epochal 'Wind of Change' speech of 1960…" (66) The role of Suez and the Cold War was found in two of the major features of British Cold War literature: its "strand of anti-Americanism and its anxieties about imperial decline, as found in the flurry of novels during the 1950s and 1960s that addressed British withdrawals." (66-67)

depicting Britain at the height of empire helped shape the reimagining of British identity. Following Suez, Europe would look as if it held the key to maintaining British presence in the global political arena.

Following Suez, the remainder of the 1950s saw increasing decolonization and fears over the loss of political territory and influence. Just weeks into his premiership, in January 1957 Macmillan requested information on the losses and gains of Britain's remaining colonies, in the interest of maintaining their colonial obligations. Seen as a turning point in decolonization, Macmillan's officials created a shortlist of territories that were likely to gain independence before 1967. These included: Malaya, Ghana, the West Indies, the Central African Federation, and Singapore.[99] In this acknowledgement of Britain's diminishing role and ability to assert power and political influence, the 1950s forced Britain to reassess and think their future imperial role. The early Fifties did not necessarily mark an end of empire, but instead exposed and highlighted the weaknesses and cracks within the empire and government. Perhaps most important was the revelation that the empire faced international political and economic pressures.[100] An example of this is when western nations began economically recovering from the Second World War, they challenged Britain's "otherwise promising post-war condition". When the European economies were weak, Britain was able to assert economic leadership, despite having austerity at home. However, as the leading European nations began to recover, they began to take advantage of Britain's lack of economic progress. Britain's value of global manufacturing exports decreased by 25.5% from 1950 to 16.5% in 1960. However, Britain had assumed that the Commonwealth and her sterling area would enable her to maintain her global position and influence, even as her trade was displaced. With the rising economic bloc of the EEC and the UK choosing to remain outside of it, it was difficult to see where Britain's new role in the new world order would be.[101] As we'll see later, the Sixties not only focused on decolonization and the Commonwealth, but membership to the EEC took center point as a political agenda. The fifties, however, remained a volatile period for Britain and her empire. In the decade following the Second World War, British governance was being tested, and discontent was

[99] Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire*, 179.
[100] Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire*, 125.
[101] Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire*, 115-116.

channeled into nationalist ideologies.[102] Along with Western Africa, Eastern African colonies began gaining independence in the mid-Fifties.

Against British politician's wishes and interests, Britain's colony Aden—which was one of her last colonial acquisitions—received independence from Prime Minister Harold Wilson in 1968, due to the economic situation in Britain and lack of control in the area.[103] Aden's independence was just another part of the same story and process that had been unfolding across the Empire over the past two decades. The Gold Coast (modern day Ghana) had been deemed a lost cause (it was concluded that independence movements were too strong to fight) by 1954, and Cyprus became a quasi-independent republic in 1959.[104] Kenya became a central concern for the British government in 1960 but still gained independence in 1963.[105]

With Gold Coast's independence in 1957, British officials felt that their other African territories were not far behind. Taking from their experiences in Asia and Africa thus far, the British government began to redefine their thinking of their African colonies; particularly as the Cold War progressed. Not wanting to lose influence in Africa, the British began to consider other alternatives to Empire for Africa—the Commonwealth. Macmillan's "Winds of Change" speech, given in South Africa in February 1960, was a significant moment in the loss of Empire. In his speech, he commented that the "winds of change are sweeping this continent", the first public acknowledgement by a British Prime Minister that the days of Empire were over, and that colonists could govern themselves.[106] And while Macmillan's speech was in response to South Africa's apartheid policies; it also dramatically sped up the decolonization process. After Ghana and Nigeria became independent, Britain realized there was no point in attempting to retain their other West African colonies, Sierra Leone and Gambia. By 1964, the "winds of change" had swept into central and eastern Africa, seeing Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, Uganda, and Nyasaland gaining independence alongside

---

[102] Boyce, *Decolonisation and the British Empire*, 125.

[103] To help facilitate decolonisation of African colonies in the 1960s, the UK government undertook economic studies on the economic potential of African nations following independence. These "common markets" of Central and Eastern Africa and their economic potential affected the advice given by British authorities to their colonial governments. For more, see: Kenneth Button, "Common markets and the decolonization of 'British Africa':

The role of economics and economists" (2019), doi.org/10.1080/20780389.2019.1669443.

[104] Kitchen, *The British Empire and Commonwealth*, 131.

[105] Kitchen, *The British Empire and Commonwealth: A Short History*, 141-42.

[106] http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/february/3/newsid_2714000/2714525.stm

Kenya.[107] Decolonization was not, however, as smooth or as consensual as it seems. Britain's bloody suppression of the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya (also known as the Mau Mau Emergency, from 1952-1960) was the result of institutionalized torture and detention camps, which was categorically denied by the British government until recently.[108] In Britain's Asian colonies, Malaya endured over a decade of guerrilla warfare against the occupying British aimed at controlling Malaya and was fought between Malaya's communist parties and the Commonwealth/ British armies.[109]

Of all the colonial losses Britain suffered in the late fifties and sixties, which ones had the greatest impact? One could argue that the loss of the African colonies as a whole was the largest impact in British policy and identity. Of course, India's independence can be seen as the moment that opened the doors to decolonization, but the rapid amounts of decolonization that took place across Africa caused the greatest amount of change and was the most noticeable. But while the loss of India—the jewel in the crown—opened the doors to decolonization and creation of a modern Commonwealth identity, the loss of African colonies (and Caribbean colonies) was the most noticeable loss in Britain's empire. This loss contributed more to the collapse of an imperialist British identity, and connection with Britishness and global influence and presence. However, independence did not simply mark the end of empire and imperialism, it suggested its continuation by another means: The Commonwealth, aid, or "the continued dominance by British and international companies."[110] With independence comes the necessary independence ceremony; and nothing cemented the relationship between Britain and her former colonial territory than attendance by a member of the Royal Family. Using the Royal Family—arguably the most outwardly recognizable symbol of Empire—their attendance at all of the independence ceremonies

---

[107] O'Sullivan, "Winds of Change", 45.

[108] For a discussion on British abuse and torture during nationalist campaigns in Kenya during the 1950s, see: David M. Anderson, "British Abuse and Torture in Kenya's Counter-Insurgency, 1952–1960." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 23, no. 4-5 (2012): 700–719. https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2012.709760. For a larger discussion on British and French colonial policies and decolonisation in Africa, see: David Birmingham's *The decolonization of Africa* (1995).

[109] Kitchen, *The British Empire and Commonwealth*, 108-111. The "Malayan Emergency" as it was known in the Colonial Office, was a 12-year guerrilla war with major atrocities on all sides involved. The Emergency is unique in the sense that it was not a battle for independence; Britain was trying to keep control of Malaya for itself, from outside Chinese forces. For the British, control of Malaya was focused on economics: Malaya was Britain's most valuable colony, producing over 1/3 of the world's rubber. Communist forces in Malaya wanted to give control of the colony to China; and as independence was not necessarily the cause of the Emergency, decolonization and views towards Malaya and her struggle for freedom is far from similar to that of Britain's African colonies.

[110] O'Sullivan, "Winds of Change", 45.

signified that Britain was still interested in the newly independent nation politically and culturally.

The Royal Family and Independence Ceremonies

The Commonwealth can not only be considered a political organization of trade and alliances, but also an empire of shared ideas and culture. With the British monarch as the Head and symbol of the Commonwealth, the Royal Family understandably played a larger, symbolic role in colonial independence. An example of this is the presence of members of the Royal Family at independence ceremonies and celebrations. By using the Royal Family to reinforce symbolic ties to the Empire, and promote joining the Commonwealth, we can see a loose emergence of a cultural empire, not just a union based on trade and diplomacy. The use of the Royal Family also connects into themes of Britishness and a national identity: The Royal Family is intrinsically linked with British identity. In examining these ceremonies/ state visits, we can see the amount of attention that was paid to the royal visit. Aside from a ceremony that celebrates independence and self-government, the visit also was a celebration of local culture; a culture that would be integrated into the Commonwealth and would be mixed into British culture consequently. The royal speeches given at these events, usually during a ball or gala, or at the opening of a newly independent parliament, emphasized a shared culture and unity between the former colonial nation and Britain.

The role of involving members of the Royal Family at independence ceremonies is of dual significance, according to Philip Murphy. He states that it was felt that the former colonial territory would have expected the presence of a member of the Royal Family, and that it was considered, by the British Government, that "a royal was therefore a gesture of goodwill by the former imperial power" and that this was "welcomed by the newly independent nation and would have the effect of cementing its relations with Britain."[111] Murphy states that some nations requested more high-ranking members of the Royal Family, such as the Duke of Edinburgh, the Prince of Wales, Princess Margaret, and Mary, The Princess Royal, but that the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, Duchess of Kent (along with her daughter, Princess Alexandra and her son, Prince Edward Duke of Kent) were the members of the Royal Family who attended the majority of independence ceremonies.[112]

---

[111] Philip Murphy, "Independence Day and the Crown" *The Round Table* 97, no. 398 (October 10, 2008): 667-75. Doi:10.1080/00358530802327852, 669.

[112] Murphy, "Independence Day and the Crown", 668-669.

Marina, The Duchess of Kent attending the Gold Coast/ Ghana Independence ceremonies in 1957 was noteworthy in the sense that this independence handover was a territory that had been considered the starting point for other independence movements across Africa. The Duchess of Kent, as aunt to The Queen, was also significant to Ghanaians, whose matriarchal society holds the role of aunt in high regard and therefore showed the importance the British government placed on maintaining strong connections with the former colony.[113] Princess Alexandra of Kent at the Nigerian Independence in 1960 marked celebrations for one of the former territories that would, along with Ghana, become of the first countries to apply for membership to the Commonwealth; keeping their connection to Britain. In the early Sixties, Princess Alexandra was ranked 10th in line to the throne, and due to being a confidante to the Queen and close in age and relation; was a highly visible member of the Royal Family, and her presence at the independence ceremonies attracted much attention. Like her mother, the Duchess of Kent, Princess Alexandra attended galas and garden parties, as well as traditional Durbars—a historically rich festival that celebrates heritage and culture.[114]

But perhaps the royal attendance at an independence ceremony that gained the most attention was Princess Margaret attending Jamaica's independence ceremonies and celebrations in 1962. Princess Margaret was one of the more popular members of the Royal Family, and at least the most fashionable. Her attendance at one of the first Caribbean colonies to gain independence gave highlight to what was becoming a regular event.[115] In the case of Princess Margaret, her world-wide popularity in the early Sixties allowed both Britain and Jamaica to use the global press to assert their goals: Britain's place within the modern world as leader of the Commonwealth, and Jamaica as a newly sovereign nation. Located within the National Archives, the files discussing Royal representation at various independence ceremonies during the 1950s and 1960s and onwards are relatively sparse in information and description. The documents contained generally discuss accommodation, transportation, suggested dates, and the occasional event; but often do not go in depth, or discuss, the types of cultural events attended. More often than not, the cultural aspects of these important tours are simply referred to as "an afternoon of cultural engagements". So,

---

[113]TNA CO 554/1387 Gold Coast independence celebrations: appointment of the Queen's representative, Duchess of Kent, 1956-57.
[114] TNA CO 554/2524, Princess Alexandra of Kent: Nigerian Independence, 1960.
[115] TNA PREM 11/3851 Princess Margaret's visit to Jamaica for Independence ceremonies and Caribbean tour, 1962.

while we are unable to discuss the types of cultural events the Royal Family was taking part in, we can still understand the importance of engaging the Royal Family with the Commonwealth and Independence ceremonies and the attention that was paid to cultivate good relations going forward.[116] Using the Royal Family at independence ceremonies not only reasserted British influence in the Commonwealth while underlining her imperial past, but also connected Commonwealth identity with the monarchy and British identity. During the transition from Empire to Commonwealth, it was essential to keep as many cultural ties to former territories as possible. The use of the Royal Family in relation to decolonization and growth of the Commonwealth is one of the clearer examples that demonstrates this understanding and feeling of political necessity.

The chapter thus far has focused heavily on the politics of the 1950s and 1960s, focusing solely on the loss of Empire and the creation, and growth, of the Commonwealth of Nations. This was necessary because only by understanding the transition that Britain was going through in the post-war decades, can one understand the cultural policies that were used by British governments. A final, short discussion follows which will explain the impact of the Commonwealth on British politics, and subsequently, British culture.

2.5: Transition from Empire to a British Commonwealth

Having discussed the process of decolonization during the Fifties and Sixties, the Commonwealth appeared as a successor to the Empire, a modern vehicle for Britain to retain her network of Imperial connections, trade, and influence. Yet for membership to the Commonwealth, terms of entry to the organization of former colonial territories were not as easy or as straightforward as perhaps was assumed.

---

[116] While the role of the Royal Family at independence ceremonies was largely successful and encouraged by both British governments and the newly independent governments, there are examples where members of the Royal Family caused problems for independence politics. S.R Ashton's article "Mountbatten, the Royal Family, and British influence in Post-independence India and Burma", *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* (2005) explores this topic. In this article, the author argues the influence Lord Mountbatten had in India and Burma following his tenure as Viceroy, and subsequent independence from the Empire. One of the main concepts seen in this article is that Mountbatten, simply by being himself, was a controversial choice when it came to diplomacy. His personal relationships and friendships with many princes and other statesmen resulted in him being viewed as biased, and ultimately, he was seen as not being much of a help (assistance). In contrast to Mountbatten, the Princess Alexandra of Kent was a more appropriate representative for Burma, and presence at other independence ceremonies, for a variety of reasons. As a neutral figure, her symbolic role at ceremonies as ambassador of The Crown was apparent. The author argues that there needs to be more studies on the role of the Royal Family in the promotion of British foreign policy in the latter Twentieth Century.

As mentioned earlier, the original members of the Commonwealth were comprised of the "old dominions"—Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa; and later, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon (Sri Lanka)—and that their early membership within the Commonwealth held status, making a sort of elite member's club.[117] As former colonial territories gained independence, the transition to becoming a member of the Commonwealth was not as easy or straight forward as one might have expected. In a note from the Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs in April 1953, in reference to the status of Gold Coast, Southern Rhodesia, and the Central African Federation, he remarked that

> "Originally it was, I think, rather loosely assumed that any Colonial territory which achieved complete self-government would automatically become a full member of the Commonwealth…So far as I have been able to ascertain, this procedure has never actually been put into practice."[118]

This statement shows that while the London Declaration in 1949 had set the path for Commonwealth membership, it had been assumed by some in government that colonies would automatically join the Commonwealth, once certain conditions were met, but that there was also a reluctance to allow this to happen. The inclusion of "this procedure has never actually been put into practice" reveals that there were possible barriers towards the former imperial territories—this simply could have been a reluctant mindset of some members within the old dominions that did not want new members—which meant they might not join the Commonwealth at all. A suggestion hinting towards a possible reluctance for new members to join the Commonwealth can be found in the early 1950s, which saw proposals for a "two-tier" approach to Commonwealth membership.

As noted in the *Observer* in April 1954, the two-tier plan argued that "members joining the Commonwealth "club" should have different status from that of the present members. After a period of probation, junior members might be admitted to senior membership."[119] For supporters of this plan, it was believed that:

---

[117] Examples of nations that had gained independence but did not apply to join the Commonwealth include Burma (Myanmar), Sudan, and Palestine. For more on this, see: S.R Ashton, "Burma, Britain, and the Commonwealth, 1946-56." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 29, no. 1 (2001): 65-91. DOI: 10.1080/03086530108583112.

[118] TNA DO 35/ 5056, Future Admission of Colonial Territories to Full Membership of the Commonwealth. This note from the Secretary of State for Colonial Affairs Alan Lennox-Boyd, is dated April 15, 1953.

[119] TNA DO 35/5056, "Two-tier Plan for Commonwealth" by Colin Legum, *Observer*, 4/4/54

"since the Colonial Empire is in a state of rapid transition new arrangements must be made to accommodate colonies which have acquired a status that, falling short of full independence, approaches self-government. The outstanding examples are Southern Rhodesia, Central African Federation, the Gold Coast, Nigeria, and some West Indian territories."[120]

This statement reveals that, while the growth of the Commonwealth was encouraged, there were reservations about which nations to admit. It can be interpreted that there is some merit towards ideas about the old dominions of the Commonwealth as wanting to retain influence and control, and when former African and Caribbean territories sought the opportunity to join the membership, the status of the old dominions was threatened. This shows that, despite the Commonwealth being depicted as a new and modern entity of shared ideas, there were lingering attitudes of empire found in a reluctance to cede power and influence. This "two-tier" plan was opposed by the Commonwealth Secretary, who "fears political implications", and ultimately was not enacted.[121] The 1954 *Observer* article ties into previous discussions amongst Churchill's cabinet, and while an austerity Britain copes with rebuilding, the loss of Empire and the emergence of a Commonwealth was clearly on the minds of many. Then-Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden had earlier addressed the growth of the Commonwealth and potential misunderstandings around membership in a telegram in 1953. Eden remarked that

"Many countries do not seem to understand that the Commonwealth is in fact a partnership of completely independent nations and that nobody can join it except as a result of consultation with and acceptance by those who are in it already."[122]

Here, Eden explains the organization of the Commonwealth as being a partnership of wholly independent nations, in which new members can only be admitted after all current members have agreed so. Eden acknowledges that applicants, most likely those nations who had recently received independence or were soon to do so, were not automatically granted membership to the Commonwealth, but did not factor in a tier system. Instead, new members would have the same status as those nations that were already a member. This is the model that is used today, one that places all members as equal partners.

---

[120] TNA DO 35/5056, "Two-tier Plan for Commonwealth" by Colin Legum, *Observer*, 4/4/54
[121] TNA DO 35/5056, "Two-tier Plan for Commonwealth" by Colin Legum, *Observer*, 4/4/54
[122] TNA DO 35/5056

As a whole, the Commonwealth is a large political union, focusing on trade, friendship, and partnership; with many of the members sharing a common history or background. As we'll see later, during the sixties and Britain's turn to Europe, the Commonwealth would also be viewed as a barrier towards European membership. But in the early Fifties, this enterprise had not taken this road yet. If we look at the Queen's 1953 Christmas speech, given from New Zealand, we see the importance expressed by the Queen about the Commonwealth, and their shared culture and connections to Britain. The Queen remarked that "Now, this great Commonwealth, of which I am so proud to be the Head, and of which that ancient Kingdom forms a part, though rich in material resources is richer still in the enterprise and courage of its peoples."[123] At the time of the speech, The Queen and Prince Philip were on their Commonwealth Tour—an extensive and highly successful tour that reached all parts of the Commonwealth, and many of the nations visited received their first visit from a sitting monarch. The Queen's tour, her understanding and her experiences with the Commonwealth were reflected within her speech. The Queen's speech referenced multiple things: the benefits of joining the Commonwealth to spread ideas, culture, and share resources; and more subtly, membership of the Commonwealth allowed Britain to retain their influence in former territories under the guise as symbolic head of state. The Queen furthered this by saying that:

> "… the United Kingdom is an equal partner with many other proud and independent nations, and she is leading yet other still backward territories forward to the same goal...As I travel across the world today, I am ever more deeply impressed with the achievement and the opportunity which the modern Commonwealth presents."[124]

This can be interpreted as saying that what was achieved by joining the Commonwealth was membership of a modern, new union of nations that promoted independence and supported former territories in taking their place in a larger global arena. The mention of "other still backward territories" can refer to the numerous colonial territories that had yet to receive independence. The Commonwealth can then, as The Queen suggests, be seen as the platform for colonial territories to transition to self-government and independence, and join a network

---

[123] Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. "Christmas Message 1953", recorded speech, Government House, Auckland, New Zealand. December 25, 1953. https://www.royal.uk/christmas-broadcast-1953
[124] Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, "Christmas Message 1953".

of trading partners, allowing them to promote themselves and their unique contributions to the global market, which includes culture.[125]

An interesting perspective as discussed by Laura Kottos is that the very nature of the Commonwealth can be seen as inspiration for the development of the EEC. She argues that

> "[The] British Commonwealth's post-war policy and the continental association of overseas territories with Europe in fact had similar causes and objectives, and that it was indeed British ideas and concepts which influenced the form of Europe's future co-operation with Empires. Britain played a major role in shaping European integration in this area since the arrangements adopted for the association of overseas territories with Europe accurately mirrored the ideas of a European Commonwealth".[126]

Kottos argues that early programs that explored integrating European nations with each other can be seen as the same method or approach undertaken by Britain with former colonial territories and the Commonwealth, connecting the Commonwealth with The United Nations, NATO, and the burgeoning EEC.[127] These modern organizations all within the same league as other new, enterprising organizations of the same era. All attempting to shape global relations and focusing on progress, and in many cases, influence.

The use of the Commonwealth of Nations as a successor to Empire is a noteworthy trend in British politics in the 1950s and 1960s. Through the Commonwealth, British politicians were able to maintain an imperial network of trade partners, which allowed for Britain to retain her global position of influence and power. However, the Commonwealth failed to provide the economic opportunities that the Britain had relied upon from her

---

[125] Perhaps controversially, in "Empire and Globalisation: From 'High Imperialism' to Decolonsation", authors Martin Thomas and Andrew Thompson argue that while globalization brought together different regions across the world, it did not "suddenly disappear" while empires were in the process of decolonization. Instead, the authors suggest that it began to work differently. They state that "The transnational networks, cross-cultural borrowings, and observed precedents that sustained the forces of anti-colonial nationalism, insurgency, and popular protest were themselves globalizing factors even if they paved the way for an alternative, late-twentieth century construction of globalization." (142-43) "According to this alternative conception of globalization, a society's freedom to make its way in the global marketplace was contingent upon its prior ability to exert its independence, and closer international integration was thus largely the product of the interplay of different national policies." (143) For more, see: Martin Thomas and Andrew Thompson, "Empire and Globalisation: from 'High Imperialism' to Decolonisation" *The International History Review* 36, no. 1 (2014): 142-170.
[126] Laura Kottos, "A 'European Commonwealth': Britain, the European League for Economic Co-operation, and European Debates on Empire, 1947- 1957." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 20, no.4 (2012): 497-515, 497.
[127] Kottos, "A 'European Commonwealth'", 497.

Empire, and discussions turned towards Europe as a new, modern platform that would give Britain both the economic advantages she was looking for, but also a new arena of influence.

2.6: Britain's Turn Towards Europe: A Brief Overview of EEC Politics

This section is a very brief overview of Britain's turn towards Europe, looking at the political decisions and opinions around British membership of the Common Market in the 1960s. This shows a political transition from a focus on the Commonwealth and decolonization, shifting towards Europe as a means for prosperity and influence.

With the decision in 1961 to apply for membership of the European Economic Community, also known as the Common Market, the questions about Britain's relationship with Europe had now become established in everyday rhetoric. Previously, this question had mainly been of interest only to foreign policy specialists and others within the political arena.[128] In 1960, debt remained a heavy burden for the British government, with the costs accrued by the Second World War and the return to civilian life still greatly affecting the nation. The economy was weakened by industry—provisions had not been made during the war for the return to normalcy—and there were no resources set aside for industrial replacement. And, as seen earlier, the transition from Empire to Commonwealth was a pressing topic for both government and the population but the Commonwealth had not provided the stability politicians had hoped.[129] Former United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson's famous 1960 statement that Britain had lost an Empire but not yet found a role suggested that British membership to the EEC was vital to British foreign policy.

However, the initial decisions to consider Britain's position and relationship with Europe could have begun in the mid-1950s, following the Suez Crisis. Shortly before his resignation, Prime Minister Antony Eden reflected on the outcome of Suez and what this could mean for Britain in the future. He reflected that:

> "…we must review our world position and our domestic capacity more
> searchingly in the light of the Suez experience, which has not so much

---

[128] M. Haeussler, "The Popular Press and Ideas of Europe: The Daily Mirror, the Daily Express, and Britain's First Application to Join the EEC, 1961-63." *Twentieth Century British History* 25, no. 1 (2012): 108-31. Accessed November 12, 2018. doi:10.1093/tcbh/hws050, 108.

[129] Brian L. Crowe, "British Entry into the Common Market: A British View." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 37, no. 2 (1972): 228-232. doi:10.2307/1191149, 229. This article was published in 1972, a year before Britain gained European membership, and the views expressed in the article provide insight into the thinking behind Britain's about the many aspects and costs of joining, or not joining, the EEC. In this quote, the lack of stability refers to trade with the Commonwealth.

changed our fortunes as revealed realities. While the consequence of this examination may be to determine us to work more closely with Europe, carrying with us, we hope our closest friends in the Commonwealth in such development, here too we must be under no illusion. Europe will not welcome us simply because that the moment it may appear to suit us to look to them."[130]

Upon Eden's resignation less than two weeks later, the new Prime Minister Harold Macmillan remained focused on Britain and the Commonwealth throughout the remainder of the 1950s. Yet as the late 1950s progressed into the 1960s, British governments soon realized that they could not base their foreign policy on independent Commonwealth countries the same way they had on a united British Empire, and the turn to Europe was reluctantly begun.[131]

Upon its establishment through the Treaty of Rome in 1957, the EEC was designed to form a common market, which would remove trade barriers between member nations and would also establish trade policies for nations outside of the economic and trade bloc. There was also the ambition to unite Europe politically, as well as economically, with some arguing that the social and political motives behind European unification as being the more significant aspects of the Treaty of Rome.[132] Beginning in 1960, the British Foreign Office became the government's leading department on European affairs and publicity around British membership of the EEC. The Foreign Office's "Common Market Campaign" was renamed "Britain in Europe" in 1963, and subsequently, the Foreign Office became a key player in organizing domestic propaganda that urged EEC membership.[133]

---

[130] PREM 11/1138, The Prime Minister's Thoughts on Suez, December 28, 1956.

[131] Crowe, "British Entry into the Common Market", 230.

[132] An in-depth analysis of the Treaty of Rome, the formation of the EEC, and the British question can be found in Alvin Adityo, Anggari Harapan, and Djoko Marinandono, "Re-Examining De Gaulle's Rejection of British Membership in the European Economic Community," *Eastern Journal of European Studies* 10, no. 2 (December 2019): pp. 5-18. Pages 8-9 explain the origins and aspirations of the EEC; the rest of the article explores why Britain wanted to join the EEC and offers insights as to why Britain's first two applications were denied. See also: Martin Dedman, *The Origins and Development of the European Union 1945-1995: A History of European Integration*, (London: Routledge, 1996). Chapter one: *Definition and Theories of European Integration, 1945-95* and chapter six: *From the Common Market to a Single Market: the Treaties of Rome (1957) to the Treaty on European Union (1992)* would be the most useful. See also: Stephen Wall, *The Official History of Britain and the European Community: From Rejection to Referendum, 1963-1975*. (London: Routledge, 2013).

[133] Paul Gliddon. "The British Foreign Office and Domestic Propaganda on the European Community, 1960–72." *Contemporary British History* 23, no. 2 (May 26, 2009): 155-80. doi:10.1080/13619460802636383., 155. This article argues that the 1960s brought a crucial transition, with the FO gearing up for entry to the Community, and from 1970 to 1972, the FO became Whitehall's main operator in home propaganda on the EC. The main focus of the article is on the years before Britain joined the EEC, 1960–72, before Britain joined the EEC.

Writing in 1972, Brian Crowe, a civil servant working within the Foreign Office on EEC relations reflected in a speech about the rationale behind Britain joining the Common Market, which included the views held by many government officials in the early 1960s. Crowe commented that politically, it was a sensible idea to join the Common Market. Along with market stability, economic growth, and additional access to resources, Crowe suggested that membership would give Britain influence in the development of Europe and global European relations. Within Europe, Britain would—as a member of a strong European community—be better able to shape their future, in contrast to an island nation attempting to protect their interests independently.[134] Crowe felt that he, and others within government, understood that "We [Britain] should be far better placed to help shape our own future as a major member of a strong European Community than as a relatively small country independently attempting to protect our interests [against Asia, the Soviet Bloc, and the United States]."[135] Attributed to issues and disagreements mostly relating to the agricultural and physical makeup of Britain compared to members of the EEC, Britain's first application to join the EEC was denied in 1963.

With the election of Wilson's Labour government in 1964, the notion of membership with Europe was again discussed, although Wilson was initially skeptical about whether Britain would be better placed within Europe or outside of it. Wilson eventually accepted that membership would be beneficial to Britain, with his fear being that outside of the EEC, Britain would be excluded from key global and political discussions and would have to watch the United States and a German/French dominated Europe discuss and make Western policy. However, Wilson was never fully convinced that economics was the sole reason British membership in the Common Market was vital. The biggest reason was the "political dangers of marginalization" should Britain stand independent from an integrated Europe.[136] And while Britain's second application for membership was again denied in 1967, for many of the same reasons as the first denial, the notion of Europe as being a new form of modernity that Britain should aspire to had been firmly planted in British politics.[137] The modernity of the

---

[134] Crowe, "British Entry into the Common Market", 232.

[135] Crowe, "British Entry into the Common Market", 232.

[136] N. Piers Ludlow, "The Discomforts of Life on the Edge: Britain and Europe, 1963-1975." *International Affairs* 88, no. 6 (2012): 1331-1340. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01135., 1334.

[137] Writing in one of his memoirs, Harold Wilson explains his thinking and rationale behind the second application. He states that starting on March 30, 1967, there was a series of Cabinet discussions and meetings about entry to the Common Market. Wilson was adamant that a final decision would not be made until every minister felt the topic had been discussed fully. By April 27th, Wilson felt Cabinet was ready to move forward with a decision. (p 386-87) On May 2, 1967, Wilson made the following statement to Cabinet: "Her Majesty's

EEC reflected earlier comments about the modernity of the Commonwealth. Europe was changing—had changed—and was now a powerful, new, and influential bloc built upon economic and political success. Both the Commonwealth and the Common Market are forms of modernity in their very establishment, a union of (somewhat) equal partners, with similar backgrounds, and similar aspirations. The modernity of the EEC was the ability to unite nations that had very recently been wartime enemies, with a focus on the future, and not the past. Britain's membership to the Common Market was desirable due to Europe's position as a main player in global politics and power, alongside the United States.

The metaphorical shift from seeing the Commonwealth as modernity towards the EEC was perhaps best reflected by broadcaster and journalist Bernard Levin. Levin commented in 1970 that "The Sixties were profligate with themes and arguments that illustrated the nation's crossroads dilemma. None did more so completely nor more vitally than this of the Common Market."[138] By the end of the 1960s, the Common Market was seen as the "talisman of the decade": Europe was identified as both the future and the goal.[139]

Conclusion

The politics of the first post-war decades was focused on three main concepts. Immediately following the end of the Second World War, British politics was shaped by German war trials and a return to normalcy. However, there were lingering attitudes of Germanophobia by some British politicians, as seen with discussions around West German rearmament and membership to NATO in the mid-1950s. The 1950s also saw political discussions to the emergence of a Commonwealth of Nations, in part due to a response of widespread and rapid decolonization. The loss of Britain's Empire greatly affected British

---

Government have today decided to make an application under Article 237 of the Treaty of Rome for membership to the European Economic Community and parallel application for membership of the European Coal and Steel Community and Euratom..." (p 389) On May 16, 1967, General de Gaulle gave a press conference and made a statement on the British application. Essentially, de Gaulle felt Britain was not in a position to join; citing the sterling and pound value and its effect on their developed market, established political arrangements, and the possible negative effects on Europe of British entry (association with the EFTA, the Community's European character and personality. (p 392-3) For more, see: Harold Wilson, *The Labour Government, 1964-1970: A Personal Record*. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971). It is also worth pointing out that Wilson was not the only Labour Eurosceptic. One of the more vocal critics against the Common Market was Barbara Castle, whose diaries from this period cover her many, colorful, thoughts. See: Barbra Castle, *The Castle Diaries, 1964-1976*, (London: Papermac, 1990). For other insights into the Wilson cabinet and Britain's second application, see: Tony Benn, *Office Without Power: Diaries 1968-1972*, (London: Arrow Books Limited, 1988) and Marcia Williams, *Inside Number 10*, (London: New English Library Ltd, 1975).

[138] Bernard Levin, *The Pendulum Years: Britain and the Sixties*. (London: Edenzer Baylis and Son, Ltd., 1970), 207.

[139] Levin, *The Pendulum Years*, 208.

politics during the 1950s and 1960s, with questions around trade, diplomacy, and influence on decision making being contemplated by successive British prime ministers. The answer to these questions was Europe and the Common Market. The 1960s reflected a shift from politics responding to decolonization and instead a focus on European membership. Culture in these decades also reflected the rapid changes occurring across Britain and her dominions, with popular culture often reflecting discussions within Whitehall.

Chapter Three: 1945-1975: A Cultural Context

Chapter two focused on discussing the political contexts of this period, examining the impact felt by the politics of war guilt, decolonization and the Commonwealth, and the turn to Europe. This chapter will now examine the cultural context of this period, looking at the ways in which popular culture responded to its surroundings, including politics. Discussions will focus on wartime commemorations and cinematic depictions of wartime Britain which assisted in curating a nostalgia for the past. This also included nostalgia for Imperial Britain. There will also be discussions focusing on the literary responses to decolonization and the growth of the Commonwealth.

3.1: Cinematic Depictions of Wartime Britain

The previous chapter explained the ways in which the Second World War was kept alive and in daily life following the end of conflict. This was due to coverage in the British press of the German war trials throughout the 1950s, which added to generational memories being formed in the 1950s still having an emphasis, or feeling the impact of, the Second World War. The results of this coverage and memory can be found in cultivation and commodification of Wartime Britain, as evidenced by the popularity of films during the 1950s and 1960s. This section will explain how war memory translated into wartime nostalgia during the period of decolonization and loss of an imperial presence.

During World War Two, cinemas were used as both entertainment and to inform and educate the public on current political and social events. Advertisements, public warnings, and newsreels prefaced entertainment; meaning that during the Second World War, the war and leisurely cinema-going were inevitably linked.[140] The films that were shown during wartime were a mix of classical themes, period dramas, or light-hearted films that depicted the ordinary Briton—but many were connected in common themes showcasing the strength of the British in the face of trouble, their steadfastness, and in a sense, Britain's national identity.[141] In *Films and British National Identity: From Dickens to Dad's Army*, Jeffery Richards discusses how many of the films produced during this period all featured themes of

---

[140] Penny Summerfield, "War, Film, Memory: Some Reflections on War Films and the Social Configuration of Memory in Britain in the 1940s and 1950s." *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 1, no. 1 (August 16, 2007): 15–23. https://doi.org/10.1386/jwcs.1.1.15_0.,15.

[141] Jeffery Richards, *Films and British National Identity: From Dickens to Dad's Army*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 85-89.

"shared sense of humor", stoicism and emotional restraint, and heroic individualism.[142] Richards argues that these themes were essential to creating a wartime cinematic representation of Britain's national character. This concept can be seen in some of the period films that were popular during wartime, such as *Lady Hamilton* (1941) and *Henry V* (1944), which despite not having a contemporary setting, subtly reflected the "ethos of the nation at war".[143] Consider the example of *Lady Hamilton* (also known as *That Hamilton Woman!)*, a period film set during the Napoleonic Wars which focuses on the relationship between Horatio Nelson and his mistress Emma Hamilton. While the film does not necessarily show the emotional restraint or morality Richards suggests is common in films from this period, *Lady Hamilton* (as well as *Henry V*) explores heroism by depicting Britain in a positive light during wartime, serving as subtle propaganda by showing Britain emerging victorious from European conflict. This is one of the common themes in period dramas shown during wartime. While there were films produced during wartime that did discuss and feature Britain at war in a contemporary time period, such as Noël Coward's 1942 *In Which We Serve*, many of the popular wartime films occurred in the following decade.

For British audiences, the adventurous films of the 1950s and 1960s that evoked World War Two were shown during periods of political uncertainty, providing a needed reminder of Britain's valor; and it is estimated that over 110 films depicting Britain during the Second World War were produced between the years 1945 and 1970.[144] Historians Geoff Eley and Penny Summerfield discuss the imagery of World War Two for 1950s audiences as presentations of collective memories.[145] Eley argues that one does not need to have immediate experience of the Second World War to "remember" it, and that those who were born after 1945 and grew up in the 1950s had their memories of the war shaped by popular representations of the war, which included film adaptions. As such, the film depictions of the war were vital in influencing an entire generation's "memories" of the war and its battles.[146]

---

[142] Richards, *Films and British National Identity*, 85-89.

[143] Clive Coultass, "British Feature Films and the Second World War." *Journal of Contemporary History* 19, no. 1 (1984): 7-22. Accessed July 21, 2021. http://www.jstor.org/stable/260423., 10.

[144] Penny Summerfield, "Public Memory Or Public Amnesia? British Women of the Second World War in Popular Films of the 1950s and 1960s." *The Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 4 (2009): 935-957. Accessed October 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1086/603598, 935. Summerfield compiles this data from the Kinematopgraph Weekly, which is an annual survey of box office statistics. She notes that the information is not always accurate or complete.

[145] Other articles by Summerfield that discuss the role of memory and war in 1950s British cinema is: Summerfield, "Dunkirk and the Popular Memory of Britain at War, 1940-1958 (2010).

[146] Geoff Eley, "Finding the Peoples War: Film, British Collective Memory, and World War II." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (June 2001): 818. Accessed July 10, 2019. doi:10.2307/2692326, 818-819.

This is shared by Summerfield and her views that the reception of films depicting World War Two were affected by memory, explaining that as many of the films were based on actual events, their autobiographical accounts mixed with real locations and events which resulted in films that were viewed as a type of documentary, or viewed as accurate historical truth.[147] The views of Summerfield and Eley demonstrate the power of memory and imagery about the Second World War, and how cinematic themes in mainstream popular culture during the 1950s reflected this. These cinematic themes included "great" battles and scenes from the Second World War; with popular films including: *The Bridge Over the River Kwai* (1957); *Ice Cold In Alex* (1958); *The Dam Busters* (1955), *The Cruel Sea* (1953); *Reach for The Sky (1956),* and *The Battle of the River Plate* (1956, later renamed *Pursuit of the Graf Spee).*[148] These films captured the public imagination, and while one can argue that the films were little more than a positive expression of British might during the Second World War, they also promoted a sense of wartime nostalgia. Both Eley and Summerfield argue that cinematic depictions of Britain at war in the 1950s is inevitably linked with a collective memory and type of national identity. In some cases, these films assisted in cultivating a sense of nostalgia for the war, which was bolstered by the notion of presenting positive and sometimes elaborated false narratives of wartime Britain. For some, a tonic for the political uncertainty of the 1950s and 1960s was found in films depicting British exceptionalism during the Second World War, which could be seen as escapism into the safety of the past.

Another part of the success around British war films in the 1950s (as opposed to contemporary ones in the 1940s) was the notion that, for the most part, the films show "the British *winning* the war as opposed to *not losing it*".[149] This concept is echoed by James Chapman's discussions on cinema and film history.[150] Chapman argues that war films in the 1950s provided a degree of comfort and certainty, by having the benefit of knowing what the

---

[147] Summerfield, "War, Film, Memory", 17.

[148] In more depth: *The Bridge over the River Kwai,* 1957, takes place in a Japanese POW camp, with British soldiers building an expansive bridge, oblivious to an Allied plan to destroy it. The film's promotional material boosted that the film was "destined to become a classic". *Ice Cold In Alex*, 1958, features a group of British medics in North Africa, attempting to cross the desert to reach British held Alexandria. *The Dam Busters*, 1955, described as "The story of how the British attacked German dams in World War II by using an ingenious technique to drop bombs where they would be most effective. *The Cruel Sea*, 1953, is a dramatic recount of a British naval convoy, and her officers. *Reach for the Sky*, 1956 is a biographic film of RAF Group Captain Douglas Bader who, despite the loss of both legs, flew a British fighter plane during World War Two.

[149] Christine Geraghty, *British Cinema in the Fifties*. (London: Routledge, 2000), 181.

[150] Professor James Chapman's many works on media and popular culture include: *The British at War: Cinema, State and Propaganda, 1939-1945* (1998), *Cinemas of the World: Film and Society from 1895 to the Present* (2003), *Past and Present: National Identity and the British Historical Film* (2005), *War and Film* (2008), and *Projecting Empire: Imperialism and Popular Cinema* (2009).

outcome of the film (the war) would be.[151] Chapman comments that "reliving the Second World War, and privileging Britain's role in winning it, was a means of reasserting national pride in the face of decline."[152] He furthers this by broadly asserting that the British war films during the 1950s were predominately cinematic examinations of national identity (and masculinity, given the main characters in many of the films were male and unable to express their emotions or true thoughts).[153] The analysis from Eley, Summerfield, and Chapman all assert the popularity of British war films during the 1950s as due to a collective nostalgia for the wartime, reasserting national pride, and providing comfort in the imagined safety of the past.

Looking further into the listed films from the 1950s, press commentary on these films seems to be largely positive, both on the films and the scenes they depict. The film *The Bridge over the River Kwai* would become one of the most successful films of the decade and was received favorably in the press. Articles commented on the film being a box office smash, receiving numerous awards, including an Oscar for Best Picture¸ and were proclaimed as "a winner" and sure to "go down as a classic in cinema history".[154] The popularity of the film is even seen in coverage of royal visits abroad. When, in 1959 Princess Alexandra of Kent was on a royal visit to Thailand, the headline declared "Princess on Kwai Bridge". Coverage of this part of the visit commented that the Princess was not on the bridge depicted in the film, but one with similar history. The film is about British soldiers in a Japanese POW camp building a vast bridge, oblivious to an allied plan to destroy the bridge upon completion and is marked with historical inaccuracies. The film combines with other war films of this era to promote the contributions and sacrifices made by individual British soldiers, not an entire organization or unit. Of the other popular films mentioned earlier, *Ice Cold in Alex* received similar accolades, commenting "it's a sizzler", "red-hot tension", and "the best film made this year".[155] Two of the wartime films even received royal premieres in aid for charity. 1955's *The Dam Busters* was viewed by Princess Margaret and the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester. While much of the commentary on these film premieres are focused on the Princess's attire,

---

[151] James Chapman, *Cinemas of the World: Film and Society from 1895 to the Present*. (London: Reaktion Books LTD, 2003), 274.
[152] Chapman, *Cinemas of the World*, 274.
[153] Chapman, *Cinemas of the World*, 274.
[154] Articles that promote the popularity of this film include: Thompson, Ron. "This film is a winner!", *Norwood News*, 14 February 1958.; "It was the film of the year", *Drogheda Argus and Leinster Journal*, 5 April 1958.; and "Kwai Film is No.2 Hit", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 10 February 1959. The last article from the *Coventry Evening Telegraph* discusses the film's popularity in Scandinavian cinemas.
[155] "Ice Cold in Alex!" *Nelson Leader*, 5 September 1958.

there is mention in the press that *The Dam Busters* was specifically chosen to aid RAF charities and that there were numerous survivors from the raid on the Ruhr Dam (which was the main plot of the film) who were in attendance and who met the Princess.[156] One article remarks that the *Dam Busters* is "the story of one of the most gallant and successful war exploits" which is hailed as "the best British wartime film since [1953's] *The Cruel Sea*."[157]. Another article on the premiere of *The Dam Busters* remarks that at the film premiere "searchlights gleamed overhead and anti-aircraft guns glistened on the roadway at the Ritz Cinema"[158] While Blitz-era searchlights and anti-aircraft guns may have seemed a bit excessive for a film premiere, the article describes the wartime ephemera proudly, as a sense of nostalgia for the Blitz spirit, noting that the film was showing as part of "The Battle for Britain Week", which was marking the 15th anniversary of the Battle.[159]

The other film to receive a royal premiere was *The Battle of the River Plate*, which depicts the first major Anglo-German naval battle of World War Two. Attending 1956's Royal Film Performance was Queen Elizabeth II and Princess Margaret.[160] *The Battle of the River Plate*, as with the previously mentioned films, received much praise in the media and was popular with the public. The *Liverpool Echo* called the film an "epic battle" that was "fought in the same spirit that won Trafalgar".[161] Yet the film was not without criticism; with one remark being that the film was "a very British film, with such a stiff upper lip that it was almost expressionless."[162] A comment that, seems to be both a compliment to the wartime spirit featured in the film, and a negative remark on the (seeming) inability to process and move on. With *The Dam Busters* and *River Plate*, these two royal premieres highlight the transition from war memory to wartime nostalgia within popular culture.

The popularity of wartime films connects to the earlier discussion on the presence of press coverage of war crime trials and the timing of some of the more popular films coincides

---

[156] "Princess Sees Dam Busters Film Premier", *Belfast Telegraph*, 17 May 1955. For those interested, Princess Margaret was wearing "a heavy lilac satin full-length backless gown trimmed with blue, pink, and lilac sequins, and long white gloves."

[157] "It's the best since 'The Cruel Sea'", *Daily Herald*, 20 May 1955.

[158] "Searchlights and A.A. guns at film premiere", *Belfast News-Letter*, 13 September 1955.

[159] "Searchlights and A.A. guns at film premiere", *Belfast News-Letter*, 13 September 1955.

[160] At this premiere, the Queen met American actress Marilyn Monroe. While the British press from the time focused on the success of the film, Pathe news commented more on these two women, both of whom were the same age, meeting for the first time; and hardly mentioned what film was actually being shown at the screening! Particular interest was shown in the Queen's velvet crinoline ball gown and emeralds, compared to Monroe's plunging and figure-enhancing gold lamé gown.

[161] "The Epic Battle of the River Plate", *Liverpool Echo*, 24 December 1956.

[162] John Ramsden, "Refocusing 'The Peoples War': British War Films of the 1950s." *Journal of Contemporary History* 33, no. 1 (January 1998): 35–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/003200949803300103, 41.

with debates on West German rearmament and their joining NATO in 1955. Given what Summerville, Chapman, and Eley have said about the popularity of war films during this period, and their connections with memory, identity, and nostalgia, the presence of the Second World War in popular culture shows how ingrained World War Two had become in identity and memory.

By 1955, ten years after the conclusion of the Second World War and 15 years after the Battle for Britain, cinematic depictions of wartime Britain and imagery were at a high. This could be for a variety of reasons. As demonstrated earlier, press coverage of German war crime trials had largely commenced (with notable exceptions), so to a degree it could be assumed that World War Two was firmly in the past and could now be commercialized without much perceived backlash. The popularity of these films suggests a few things: the cultivation of nostalgia and remembering the Second World War in a more eulogistic light, directed at those who matured during the conflict, a reasserting of Britain's military prowess during the collapse of the Empire (and the catastrophic Suez Crisis in 1956), and showcasing the best of Britain while her politicians were attempting to find her a new global role. In this case, using cinema to showcase Britain and World War Two in a positive light can be viewed in the same sense as the use of cultural policies in crafting a newer identity or cultural norm. In some instances, German actors used their position as a cultural connection to Europe to reconcile or comment upon Anglo-German relations. In the article ""The Most Explosive Object to Hit Britain since the V2!": The British Films of Hardy Kruger and Anglo-German Relations during the 1950s", the author examines the popularity of German actor Hardy Kruger in British cinema during the Fifties.[163] Kruger's British career is largely attributed to his sex appeal and appearance. Sometimes being linked to a male "blond bombshell", Kruger's Germanic ethnicity is often commented upon in press relating to his films. Comments surrounding Kruger often evoked the Second World War, such as the comment that Kruger is "the most explosive object to hit Britain since the V2!" as well as popular film critic Tom Hutchinson's jest that the star's takeover of British cinema was reminiscent of "the old German doctrine ... tomorrow the world."" [164] Kruger was aware of the stigma around his

---

[163] This article "investigates the brief British career of the German actor Hardy Kruger during the 1950s. It examines his popularity with British audiences, focusing on his appeal to younger cinemagoers, especially women. It also discusses how his star persona and screen performances reflected wider tensions in contemporary Anglo-German relations." Melanie Williams, "The Most Explosive Object to Hit Britain since the V2!": The British Films of Hardy Kruger and Anglo-German Relations during the 1950s. *Cinema Journal* 46, no.1 (Autumn 2006): 85-107. Accessed March 22, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4137153, 86.
[164] Williams, "The Most Explosive Object to Hit Britain since the V2!", 88.

nationality, as evidenced in an article he published in 1960 entitled "As a Young German, This is How I see Things Now". In this article, published in the *Evening Standard*, Kruger addressed his time in the SS and Hitler Youth, the Nazi atrocities, and German rearmament. "As a Young German" was an outwardly political statement from the popular actor, and in turn, transitioned Kruger from solely an actor into a representative of modern Germany in Britain.[165] For 1960s audiences mixing celebrity with politics was a newer phenomenon. While this is just but one example, Kruger's popularity, his typecast as German soldiers, and his wading into politics demonstrates how German politics and the Second World War were firm fixtures in pop culture in the 1950s. German typecasting aside, commentary on the content of films depicting the Second World War again demonstrates the power of wartime nostalgia for a country who was transitioning for an empire and position of global influence to one that was competing with the United States, USSR, and Europe. The comments made by Kruger, and how films evoking or taking place during World War Two have the power to influence public views, is also demonstrated by another film in the 1960s: *The Great Escape*.

One of the most successful films depicting Britain at war was actually an American made film, starring a combination of American and British actors, and was loosely based on a historic event. 1963's *The Great Escape* is a fictionalized account of Allied POWs in a German prisoner of war camp and their daring escape by constructing tunnels to lead the men to safety. While only three of the estimated 78 POW's actually managed to successfully escape from the prison camp, the popularity of the film (and the memoir it was based upon) personified a major pillar of British collective memory of the war due to depictions of "Allied ingenuity in the face of German evil", with the men being celebrated as national heroes.[166] The significance behind this film and its contribution to popular culture can be seen in how influential the film became in swaying public opinion towards an Anglo-German scheme for compensation towards British victims of Nazism, a topic that is discussed thoroughly by Susanna Schrafstetter.

In 1964, there was a compensation scheme between West Germany and Britain that was directed towards victims of the Third Reich, with the scheme providing the British

---

[165] Williams, "The Most Explosive Object to Hit Britain since the V2!", 98-100. The article mentioned in this passage, "I am a Young German…", can be found on the British Newspaper Archives. *Evening Standard,* January 12, 1960, 5.

[166] Susanna Schrafstetter, "'Gentlemen, the Cheese is all Gone!' British POWs, the 'Great Escape' and the Anglo-German Agreement for Compensation to Victims of Nazism" *Contemporary European History* 17 (2008): 23-43, 35.

government £1 million to use at their discretion. This was not the first scheme of this kind; for much of the 1950s, European nations (many of which had been occupied by Nazi Germany) had requested a similar program.[167] The details of the compensation scheme are very complex, with the Foreign Office being responsible for the distribution of compensation to the victims, and for determining who was eligible for payments. The Foreign Office considered those eligible as having been persecuted based on "ideology, race, religion, and nationality"; with those who had suffered within civil prisons, civilian internment camps, and prisoner of war camps not being eligible.[168] The rationale for this was due to the little amount of funding received in anticipation of large numbers of applicants, and due to this strict rationale, there were 3046 claims rejected compared to only 1015 approved, out of a total number of 6608 application forms being distributed.[169] And while the initial response from the Foreign Office was to be as reasonable as possible, there was the expected public (and Parliamentary) backlash to the exclusion of POWs from the compensation scheme—a perceived slighting to the national heroes. While Schrafstetter discusses the role played by Parliament and the Press over this situation, she contends that the larger issue was that both the public and the press had interpreted "compensation for British victims of Nazism largely as compensation for British war heroes", with the press and parliament celebrating "British wartime ingenuity and resistance without giving too much thought to the millions of persecuted victims".[170] Schrafstetter's revelation that the memory of the Second World War was shaped by British suffering and British exceptionalism, and less the Holocaust or German occupation across Europe, links into the wider discussion around the role of British war films and depictions of wartime Britain in shaping nostalgia for the war years. In looking at these films and their resulting popularity, we see that the general public was keen to see positive depictions of the events they witnessed, either directly in conflict, or second-hand in news bulletins, letters, and stories; and less so to remember the atrocities of wartime.

---

[167] Schrafstetter, "Gentlemen, the Cheese is all Gone", 26. For more on these schemes, see: the 1946 Paris Reparations Conference, the 1952 Bonn Settlement Convention, the 1953 London Debt Conference, and the Federal German Compensation Law of 1953.

[168] Schrafstetter, "Gentlemen, the Cheese is all Gone", 29-30.

[169] Hansard, HC Deb. 23 January 1967, Vol. 739, CC-188-90W.

[170] Schrafstetter, "Gentlemen, the Cheese is all Gone", 42; some examples from the press which discusses the exclusion of British POW's or non-Jewish victims are: "Forgotten People", *Daily Mirror*, 29 April 1964, "£1 Million for Nazi Victims", *Liverpool Echo*, 9 June 1964, "Justice for Nazi Victims", *Kensington Post*, 28 May 1967, "MP's Plea for British Nazi Victims", *Reading Evening Post*, 20 January 1966, and ""No Blood Money for Nazi Victim", *Kensington Post*, 3 March 1967. The article quoted by Schrafstetter also includes a selection of British press clippings of the same manner.

Something else to consider is the fact that many of these wartime films were shown in black and white; which besides being cost effective, allowed the filmmakers to use actual wartime footage in their film; which again, only reiterated the impression that the films were actually made during the war and represented historical truth. John Ramsden comments that "deliberately obscuring the passage of time" was a popular film technique used in this era, particularly with wartime films.[171] Ramsden also comments in his article *Refocusing 'The People's War': British War Films of the 1950s* that by the mid-Fifties, "war films were needed as a kind of ego boost, a nostalgia for a time when Britain was great."[172] This statement by Ramsden connects numerous aspects of British life during the 1950s. Consequences from austerity and the masses of debt that Britain had incurred during the war, contrasted with the affluence seen in American society and the successful rebuilding of Europe all point to a British perspective that their influence in the world was dwindling.

By examining the popularity of war films during the 1950s and 1960s and the themes they represented, such as national pride and Britain's role in global affairs, and the political context of these decades, their popularity and necessity is well understood; as is the ability of the films to help shape public views and perceptions of Britain at War. These films often portrayed characters with strong moral character, no-nonsense attitudes and the understanding—and willingness—to get the job done and do what was necessary all demonstrated the characteristics that film makers and audiences viewed as essential to Britishness: duty and the stiff upper lip. These definitions and portrayals of Britishness on screen were a needed tonic to the uncertainty of the 1950s.[173] Decolonization, West German rearmament and membership to NATO, and Britain's diminishing influence in global affairs post-Suez all affected ideas of Britain's national identity. As festivals, art exhibitions and cultural polices in the 1960s and 1970s would be used to promote Britain more aligned with

---

[171] Ramsden, "Refocusing 'The People's War'", 37.

[172] Ramsden, "Refocusing 'The People's War'", 59.

[173] For a broader overview of 1950s British cinema, see: Ian Mackillop and Neil Sinyard,ed., *British cinema of the 1950s: a celebration* (2003), which includes a helpful table showing the top films of each year over the decade; H. Mark Glancy, *When Hollywood Loved Britain: The Hollywood 'British' Film, 1939-1945* (1999), which explores how Hollywood capitalized on depictions of British history, literature, and culture; including Empire and geographical settings, and how American filmmakers interpreted Britain. Film examples include *Cavalcade* (1932), *Mrs. Miniver* (1942), and *National Velvet* (1944). See also: Justine Ashby and Andrew Higson, eds., *British Cinema, Past and Present* (2000), chapter 13: *Cinema, propaganda and national identity: British film and the Second World War* by James Chapman is useful; and, Christine Geraghty, *British Cinema in the Fifties: Gender, Genre and the 'New Look'* (2000), chapters 2: *Modernity, the modern and fifties Britain,* 7: *The Commonwealth film and the liberal dilemma,* 9: *Femininity in the fifties: the new woman and the problem of the female star*, and 10: *The fifties war film: creating space for the triumph of masculinity* are all useful.

Europe; popular films in the 1950s depicting the Second World War helped to provide a comforting and nostalgic look into the recent past.

In examining wartime commemorations and British war films, and the impact of war memory and coverage of German war trials, both demonstrate clearly their role in reinforcing nostalgia for periods of history that are viewed as times of British exceptionalism during periods of political uncertainty. The use of wartime commemorations also played a role in establishing a sense of nostalgia for the Second World War.

3.2: Wartime Commemorations as a form of Nostalgia

This chapter thus far has examined the presence of popular cinematic depictions of Britain and war, and visions of British wartime exceptionalism in British popular culture, which built upon the role of German war trials and war memory in shaping post-war British politics. These films influenced public perceptions of the war, as demonstrated by both their popularity and their influence in politics (as discussed with *The Great Escape*). A lesser form of nostalgia that had the position of influencing British war memory and helping maintain the presence of the Second World War long after VE Day was wartime commemorations, which is the focus of this section.

Alongside the wartime films of the 1950s, wartime commemorations and remembrance ceremonies helped, perhaps unintentionally, to reinforce a nation's nostalgia for the past. Commemorations around events marking the Second World War (as well as World War One) would be some of the main public features that helped keep the past alive. As with the study of memory and its impact on history, as discussed earlier in this thesis, the role of commemorations and remembrance has been discussed by historians, especially when looking at the role of commemorations around the First and Second World Wars.[174] Commemorations and remembrance are often linked to studies on social memory, and historians comment that memorialization or commemoration ceremonies are often part and parcel of the act of war or conflict; traditionally feeling that when a war is seen as glorious or justified, ceremonies and memorials are erected by leaders to honor veterans and these

---

[174] Articles and books that explore war and commemoration include: Gill Abousnnouga and David Machin, "The changing spaces of war commemorations: a multimodal analysis of the discourses of British monuments" (2011), Stephanie AH Belanger and Renee Dickason, *War Memories: Commemoration, Recollections, and Writings on War* (2017), in particular section three: *Collective War Memories in Art and Popular Fictions*; TG Ashplant, et al, *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (2000), and Joan Beaumont, "Commemoration in Australia: A memory orgy?" (2015).

events.[175] Most view the First World War as the important marker in widespread memorialization, with monuments and memorials to the Great War being found as a focal point in most villages, towns, and cities across the UK; which allowed for communities to grieve but also served as "instruments to unite the country and strengthen national identity".[176] We see this when looking at commemorations for the Second World War in the latter half of the Twentieth Century.

As discussed earlier, politics in the mid-to-late Fifties was not only marked by decolonization, West German membership in NATO and rearmament; but also was marked by the beginning of regular wartime commemorations. While the largest and more significant wartime commemorations began in 1985 to mark the 40th Anniversary of the D-Day landings; there were minor commemorations in 1957, and 1965 for the 21st Anniversary.[177] Press footage and commentary on the 1985 40th Anniversary commemorations featured substantial coverage of The Queen and Duke of Edinburgh attending ceremonies, gala performances, and other commemorative events; along with other members of the Royal Family. Britain's wartime consort Queen Elizabeth, The Queen Mother was a regular feature at many of these ceremonies, attending most commemorative events until her death in 2002, and often taking prime place of importance over her daughter, the Queen. However, in the late Fifties and Sixties, many of those attending the ceremonial events were political figures, many of whom had held both military or political positions during the war; and former servicemen. Attendance for the 1957 commemorations were not well publicized, with mentions of Prime Minister Anthony Eden and Winston Churchill attending events, along with veterans. There was more notice taken for the 21st anniversary in 1965; including events in Normandy, Caen, and Portsmouth, with one event in Portsmouth including D-Day veterans attending a march-past, and a speech from former US President General Eisenhower.[178] Due to the earlier ceremonies largely focusing on veterans and politicians from that era, the focus remained on those who had played an active role in the global conflict, and despite the prominence of wartime imagery in cinemas, commemoration ceremonies it seems had not quite yet become a driving force behind nostalgia for Wartime Britain, which also had the responsibility for

---

[175] Michael Keren, *War Memory and Popular Culture: Essays on Modes of Remembrance and Commemoration*, (London: McFarland and Company, Inc, Publishers, 2009), 1.

[176] Nataliya Danilova, *The Politics of War Commemoration in the UK and Russia*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 53-54.

[177] An example of 1984's coverage includes: "D-Day Visit for the Queen", *Liverpool Echo*, 1 March 1984.

[178] "D-Day veterans for Portsmouth celebrations", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 5 June 1965; "D-Day veterans to march again", *Belfast Telegraph*, 5 June 1965.

keeping the war "alive" and in memory for those who were born after conflict ended. This began to change at the end of the Sixties when commemorations began looking at British memories of the war.

In 1970, for the 25th Anniversary commemorations, there was press commentary focusing on memories of D-Day and VE Day, as well as the war in general. A newspaper article from 1970 titled "Memories of Street's VE Day celebrations 25 years ago" is filled with nostalgic memories from the celebrations across the country in 1945. This piece however is entirely positive, and focuses on the celebrations and merriment, with no mention of the Second World War at all.[179] The commemorations also included festive stamps, envelopes, and postmarks marking the anniversary, featuring maps, Allied flags, and bearing images of Wartime leaders such as Churchill, Roosevelt and Eisenhower, de Gaulle, and others. Another event for the 25th Anniversary included a "triumphant voyage" of 900 veterans and their families, returning to Normandy for three days of events that was described as "a nostalgic tour" of "special ceremonies and celebrations".[180] Another newspaper interviewed "the next generation" that has grown up after the end of the war, asking them how they regarded the war, its purpose, and its significance; commenting that Britain was facing a wave of nostalgia for Wartime.[181] Many of those interviewed for an article entitled "Youth—and a war they never knew" felt indifferent to the sacrifices made, unsure of what they really were, but noting that they had regularly been reminded by parents and grandparents that they should be lucky Hitler never invaded Britain, and that Britain won the war; and of this some were thankful, commenting on their freedoms and liberties. Some commented how they had family or friends that holidayed in Italy, remarking that since they had liberated Italy, "it owed something to them", creating a feeling of the Second World War still shaping their daily lives. Other comments were towards pacifism, with many thinking that Britain would never fight a war again, and commenting on American intervention in Vietnam as an example of modern war "not solving anything".[182] There is no mention of the hardships of the war, just a feeling of indifference towards the war, but those interviewed spoke of the Second World War as if it was part of their memory, and occurred within their life, with some students interviewed commenting that the war and history was going to

---

[179] Muriel Searle, "Memories of Street's VE Day celebrations 25 years ago", *Cheddar Valley Gazette*, 29 May 1970.
[180] "Triumphant voyage will recall D Day landings", *Runcorn Daily News*, 24 April 1969.
[181] "Now what do the youngster's think?", *Reading Evening Post*, 19 June 1969.
[182] Geoff Matthews, "Youth—and a war they never knew", *Reading Evening Post*, 20 June 1969.

suffocate their lives, with many feeling that their parents and grandparents clung to the war to form part of their identity, not capable of letting it go. While this is just a few examples, it does show that the memories of wartime by the end of the 1960s, perhaps in part to the many British war films, was that the Second World War was viewed firmly in a nostalgic light, with mention of the wartime hardships rare, which continues to help cultivate the use of nostalgia in popular culture during this period.[183] As wartime commemorations grew in frequency and publicity, the cultural reimagining of Britain at War continued to integrate the past into the present, which for many, resulted in the Second World War never really ending, but instead being a regular part of daily life, even decades later; challenging notions of modernity and political aspirations of successive governments.

The presence of German war trials and popular British war films, and wartime commemorations during this period helped keep the memory of the war alive, albeit in a distorted view, which in turn engrained the Second World War into popular culture. One of the emerging aspects of this period is the use of nostalgia, and how it helped to shape British popular culture.

3.3: Themes of Nostalgia within Popular Culture

Elements of nostalgia flowed throughout Britain's popular culture scene during the 1950s, 60s, and 70s; often at times in a contradiction to the themes of modernism that were presented in museums, galleries, and cultural policies. This concept will be discussed throughout this chapter, in an attempt to show that the modern and forward-thinking policies put forth in the arts community, and at times various governments, was obstructed or frustrated by other trends in popular culture. While chapter five will examine the role of modernism in art, architecture, furniture design, and politics, connecting with political aspirations of the Labour Party in the late 1940s and early 1960s; nostalgia remained a palpable trend in popular culture that was consumed by Britons. And while this period had elements of modernism that were indeed extremely popular—evidenced by the home

---

[183] It is worth noting that since 1927, the British Legion's Festival of Remembrance has taken place at Albert Hall, London; commemorating veterans and various wartime experiences. While this event happens annually, particular attention is paid to years that have milestone events; such as 1965 and 1970, where D-Day anniversaries are marked. This event, along with Remembrance Sunday, is attended by armed forces representatives and numerous members of the Royal Family, including the monarch. While these commemorations do mark events relating to the Second World War, they are all encompassing of wartime experiences and the armed forces. We can assume that until the larger anniversaries, such as the 40th anniversary of the D-Day landings and VE Day, memorialization of the Second World War was restricted to November's annual remembrance events; or commemorations sponsored by individual organizations.

interiors debuted at the Festival of Britain becoming the dominate trend in interior design for the next decade—there was also a resurgence of Victoriana, challenging the popular designs of Robin and Lucienne Day, Ernest Race, and Joyce Clissold.

Beginning in the mid-1950s, London-based Welsh designer Laura Ashley emerged as a leading fashion, textiles, and home interior designer with a style firmly rooted in traditional, country styles. When the first major Laura Ashley shop opened in London in 1969, Ashley began creating Edwardian-style dresses with Victoriana prints, mixing with nostalgic themes and a desire for the comfort of the past. Her designs were a contrast to Mary Quant's modern designs in the Sixties, and quickly became popular, soon exporting to 30 countries in the early 1970s.[184] Ashley commented in 1973 that the immense popularity of her clothing and designs was from the understanding that her clothing was a "kick against this permissive society" and that her clothes were created for relaxed, informal situations.[185] In an article from 1974, the press notes that the "return of the Victorian arabesque" was largely due to the popularity of Laura Ashley's designs, and was not limited to clothing styles and tastes.[186] The article notes that "it was not so long ago that good contemporary design was equated with simplicity of form, functionalism, and plain colors" and that now, the post-war generation had "taken a more sympathetic view of the Victorians" and their art and designs were "currently undergoing a remarkable renaissance", with Laura Ashley becoming one of the leading designers of the 1970s and 1980s.[187]

Laura Ashley's designs in clothing, wallpapers, and other home furnishings in the 1970s suggest that the yearning for the imperial past equated to a generation looking backwards to a period that, in their minds, was better off than their current.[188] The popularity of Ashley's designs, mixed with the popular Seventies television show *Upstairs, Downstairs* suggests that the bleakness of the early Seventies—unemployment, union strikes, and three-day work weeks—was met with a craving for ephemera from the traditional British past, in a rejection of the bright and optimistic future that had been presented by the Festival of Britain

[184] "Newcomers", *Westminster and Pimlico News,* 22 May 1970.

[185] Anthony Everitt, "Old Fashioned Girls", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 3 February 1973.

[186] "The Return of the Victorian Arabesque", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 August 1974.

[187] "The Return of the Victorian Arabesque", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 August 1974.

[188] For more public commentary on the popularity of Ashley's designs, see the following newspaper articles: "What's new from Laura", *Belfast Telegraph,* 17 March 1978; "Loosing out on Laura", *Birmingham Daily Post,* 2 August 1977; "Laura Ashley comes to Chester", *Cheshire Observer*, 6 December 1974; and "Fashion is Child's Play for Laura", *Liverpool Echo*, 10 December 1979.

and Fanfare for Europe.[189] Instead, the craving for the comforts seemingly offered by the empire suggests changes in attitudes around Britain and her image following membership to the European Community in 1973. The comforts offered by Victorian prints on Edwardian dresses, reprints of William Morris wallpapers, and country houses reinforced concepts of British exceptionalism and identity, when the bedrocks of politics were beginning to change drastically. When comparing the popularity of Victoriana shortly following an era of contemporary and modernist designs, it suggests that there were popular trends in society that rejected the modernism promoted by political parties, museums, and its associated cultural policies.

3.4: Influences of Cosmopolitan European Culture and Imperial Nostalgia

This chapter will now shift towards discussing various influences within popular culture in the 1960s and 1970s. These are cosmopolitanism and nostalgia, which reveals conflicting aspects of popular culture. This chapter thus far has shown the ways in which the memory of the Second World War was kept ingrained and alive in popular culture, through popular cinematic depictions of Britain during wartime, and through wartime commemorations. As discussed with the influences of Laura Ashley on design and fashion trends, it can be suggested that there were aspects of society in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s that remained firmly rooted in the past. Cosmopolitanism is an interesting concept because, unlike forms of nostalgia, it suggested an influence of global culture that was being embraced by some Britons, during a period of decolonization and ambitions of European membership.

Cosmopolitanism is important to discuss because global influences in British culture was not a new phenomenon that arose in the sixties and seventies. This adds nuance to the thesis by showing that the uniting of Europe under a shared political system suggested cosmopolitanism as the future for prosperity: a union of shared politics, culture without barriers, and eventually perhaps borderless countries. Newer European social influences in Sixties cinema encouraged openness to other cultures. In fashion and jewelry trends, European designs had long been culturally significant in shaping British tastes aesthetically. The first part of this section will explore how in the 1960s, European cinema suggested cosmopolitanism, but will argue that contrary to suggestions from Prime Minister Heath in

---

[189] The Fanfare for Europe and the Festival of Britain will be discussed in depth in chapter five.

the 1970s, Britain had not just suddenly become interested in European culture, giving examples of Europe's long influence on British culture.

In contrast, following Britain's membership into the Common Market in 1973, nostalgia for the British past and local cultures make a resurgence, challenging the idea of Britons as Europeans. Popular themes of Victorian and Edwardian Britain would splash across televisions and high street shops, and the comforts and safety of the past would challenge European cultural integration, a constant conflict between the cultural imagery of "Britishness"—as demonstrated by the success of imperial nostalgia, and the political turn towards Europe, whose cultural integration struggled to find a footing. This section will also examine the role nostalgia played in the shifting British identity and culture, showcasing a struggle between the forward-looking, cosmopolitan European integration, and a nostalgic yearning for the seemingly great past.

Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is defined as the belief that openness to other cultures and peoples enriches one's own country and contains views of belonging to a single community.[190] Similar to the anthropological theory on cultural diffusion, which describes the spread of cultural practices and beliefs, as well as foods, music, and sport; cosmopolitanism encourages a spread of culture and the arts. This theory of globalization encourages open borders, allowing peoples and their cultures to move seamlessly, merging into one all-encompassing culture with sub-identities (such as Welsh-European, Scottish-European, as discussed in chapter four). This allows people, events, and things to become more and more connected, and the lines between individual cultures and shared cultures begin to blur.[191] Cosmopolitanism was an important aspect of membership to the European Community, because it allowed for regional cultures to promote their own identities abroad; as well as expanding their identity to include formerly outside entities. This section will look at Britain

---

[190] Craig Calhoun, "Cosmopolitanism in the Modern Social Imaginary." *Daedalus* 137, no. 3 (2008): 105–14. https://doi.org/10.1162/daed.2008.137.3.105, 107.

[191] In the article "Cosmopolitanism" by Pheng Cheah, *Theory, Culture and Society* 23, no. 2-3 (2006), the author argues that these things do not automatically occur (the sharing of culture, people, and things, as listed above). Because globalization does not automatically take place, these vital connections sometimes do not happen, which prevents cosmopolitanism from effectively happening. Cheah argues that Cosmopolitanism shifted from an intellectual ethos to one that was ingrained in political consciousness, and as such, affected major political decisions in the latter Twentieth Century.

as a whole, exploring how cosmopolitanism in the Sixties can be found in European films in cinemas and fashion and design influences.

Beginning in the 1960s, accessibility to European cinema became increasingly attainable for British audiences. Owing thanks in large part to the expansion of art-house cinemas and university film societies, both Ealing Studios and Hollywood (who produced most films shown in the UK) were now in competition with the work of European directors such as Ingmar Bergman, Federico Fellini and François Truffaut.[192] Looking at some of the popular European films of the Sixties and Seventies, these award-winning films include *La Dolce Vita* (1960) and *Amarcord* (1973) by Italian director Federico Fellini; *Wild Strawberries* (*Smultronstället,* 1957) by Swedish director Ingmar Bergman; and *The 400 Blows* (1959) and *Day for Night* (1973) by French director François Truffaut. These films were not only critically successful, garnering numerous accolades, they were also commercially successful globally[193]. Period newspaper articles for these films recalled them as contributing to the "high reputation of Italian films"[194] and possessing the "fundamental simplicity" to make a masterpiece.[195] Besides Fellini and Bergman, François Truffaut was particularly influential due to his heavy influence in French New Wave films of the 1960s. Considered one of the founding directors of French New Wave, his films rejected traditional themes and styles of filmmaking. While most of Truffaut's films received BAFTA, César, and Academy Award nominations/ wins; his films would not have been shown across cinemas in the UK and would have only appealed to an already enlightened population. Taken from a series of interviews from Sixties cinemagoers, the article "Windows on the World: Memories of a European cinema in 1960s Britain" explains the impact foreign films had on British culture during this decade. Some of the comments made about the impact European cinema had on their lives include a man who lived in Yorkshire in the 1960s who regarded the Italian films he watched as "an introduction to the New World".[196] Another

---

[192]Melvin Stokes and Matthew Jones, "Windows on the World: Memories of a European cinema in 1960s Britain". *Memory Studies* 10, no. 1. (2017): 78-90. Accessed April 10, 2019. DOI: 10.11177/1750698016670794, 78.

[193] Looking only at French and Italian films at the Academy Awards, France won 23 awards and Italy won 22 awards, both in various categories; between the years 1960-1975.

[194] This article referred to *La Dolce Vita* and how 1960 was an extraordinary year for Italian films. "La Dolce Vita", *The Sphere*, 10 December 1960.

[195] This 1958 article discusses at length Ingmar Bergman's film *Wild Strawberries*, which is considered to be one of his best pieces of work. The article comments that "Not all masterpieces are fundamentally simple" but that *Wild Strawberries* "has the fundamental simplicity of many a masterpiece". Dent, Alan. "Life's Journey from Sweden", *Illustrated London News*, 15 November 1958.

[196] Stokes, "Windows on the World", 85.

viewer commented that they enjoyed European films "because they were so different and opened up new worlds to me".[197] As Melvin Stokes and Matthew Jones write, for many cinemagoers, European films they viewed in the 1960s had a considerable influence on establishing their wider outlook on life. "I became aware", wrote one enlightened observer, "that my cinemagoing was shaping me and my taste in many things. There was always the element of escapism, but foreign language films brought a new seriousness"[198]

Keeping in mind that it would be a minority of Britons who viewed European films in the cinema, the films would not have had an impact on cultural consciousness of the nation. They would have, however, tied into the cultural sector often connected to London. As seen in future chapters, London hosted numerous exhibitions and festivals promoting shared culture with Europe and the Commonwealth, and European films would have contributed to the growing sense of cosmopolitanism. While European films are just one form of cosmopolitanism occurring in the 1960s, they connect with wide-scale events like the Commonwealth Festival of Arts, Fanfare for Europe, and Anglo-European art exchanges that were beginning to emerge in schools and universities. These events all promoted ideas of a shared culture, one that was accessible by all who wanted to participate, and again encouraged adapting British identity to one that was more cosmopolitan. European cinema on British screens in the Sixties presented a new world to the Britons, which emerged around the same time as the international package holiday. Beginning in the late 1950s, package holidays provided an affordable way for the average Briton to travel outside of the UK, exploring European cities and Mediterranean coastal cities and beaches. European travel had largely been the reserve of the wealthy and aristocrats, but once travel became affordable to the middle class, like European films, it exposed large swathes of Britons to cultures outside their own. As mentioned in Craig Calhoun's article "Cosmopolitanism in the Social Imaginary", exposure to different cultures and societal norms provided "a positive orientation to European integration and engagement with the rest of the world" because it was now more accessible.[199]

Films are one example of cultural exchanges that were not sponsored by the State or an institution; others include architecture and furniture design, and fashion. Examples of Scandinavian influences in architecture, furniture design, and even urban planning was seen

[197] Stokes, "Windows on the World", 88.
[198] Stokes, "Windows on the World", 88.
[199] Calhoun, "Cosmopolitanism", 108.

in early post-war modern furnishing and homeware exhibitions at the Victoria and Albert museum, and more notably in 1951's Festival of Britain. In fashion, European influences had long been viewed the epitome of sophistication. Jewelry firms such as France's Boucheron, Van Cleef & Arpels, and Cartier drove stiff competition for Britain's Garrards, Mappin & Webb, and Collingwood. From the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, these French firms often designed pieces for members of the British Royal Family and aristocracy, as well as the wealthy; with their designs considerably influencing jewelry trends seen in costume pieces worn by the general public. An example of this would be Cartier's modernist art deco designs of onyx and diamond, which heavily influenced the designs and patterns found in Lisner, Weiss, and Trifari whose mimicked pieces used coral, paste, and enamel in metal settings and were marketed towards the middle class. Many of these mid-century pieces are now found in Britain's vintage stores and antique markets, being sold as classic pieces of British 1950s and 1960s jewelry designs. Looking back even further, Indian and oriental designs in jewelry was also popular amongst Britain's upper classes; with Queen Victoria wearing "the Oriental Tiara", later designated an heirloom of the Crown; and Cartier making their first piece of "tutti frutti" jewelry for Queen Alexandra in 1901, to compliment her gowns from India.[200] "Tutti frutti" jewelry designed by Cartier would become extremely popular following the First World War throughout the 1920s, 30s and 40s; and was owned by members of the Royal Family, as well as mimicked in Vauxhall glass for costume firms such like Coro (which amusingly called the design "fruit salad") and Trifari. For jewelry, cosmopolitanism is found in the popularity and presence of European-crafted jewels, that were later created cheaply for the masses.

Clothing designers such as British-born Charles Frederick Worth and his French fashion house *House of Worth* dominated France, Europe, America, and Britain as a leading clothing designer in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Worth was later replaced by Spain's Cristobal Balenciaga and France's Christian Dior, Lanvin, and Yves St Laurent

---

[200] Designed by Prince Albert in 1853, "The Oriental Tiara" was owned by Queen Victoria and is now considered an heirloom of the Crown, which means it is passed from monarch to monarch (the tiara and matching parure was one of two major pieces of jewellery Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother wore during her long widowhood; the other being jewellery designed by France's Boucheron). According to the Royal Collection Trust, the tiara was designed with oriental themes that was inspired by Queen Victoria's acquisition of the Lahore jewels in 1850-1851. RCIN 200174 - The Oriental tiara. Retrieved November 12, 2020, from https://www.rct.uk/collection/themes/exhibitions/victoria-albert-art-love/the-queens-gallery-buckingham-palace/the-oriental-tiara. For more on Cartier's Tutti Frutti collection and its connection to Queen Alexandra, see: "Selling Cartier's Tutti Frutti Jewelry." Sothebys.com. Accessed November 12, 2020. https://www.sothebys.com/en/sell/jewelry/cartier/tutti-frutti.

who dominated the fashion world and again, were seen as the epitome of fashionable dressing. While British designers such as Norman Hartnell in the 1950s, Mary Quant in the 1960s, and Biba in the early 1970s also produced popular designs; the presence of European designers, especially French, was already ingrained in British consciousness. Unlike the new presence of popular European films in British cinemas, European influences in British fashion palates was not a post-war phenomenon. Cosmopolitanism in this sense was the long-standing embrace of European fashion palates, adopting them for all social classes. An example here is the French New Look, debuted in Britain by Princess Margaret, which featured the nipped waist and full skirt, and was adopted by almost all British fashion designers in the 1950s.

However, despite the almost traditional embrace of European fashion trends in Britain, British fashion magazines in the 1960s and 1970s would feature the best of European fashion as the newest and most sought after in clothing trends, making observations about the "newness" of European fashion. Examples of this include the September 1969 issue of *Vogue*, with the main stories being "Your Prettiest New Looks in Paris Fashion" and "Beauty gossip from all over the world"; September 1970 advertising "Paris Hemlines: Straight talk on the new fashion"; and March 1971 showcasing "New fashion zest from Rome" and "Paris Now- the sexy looks of the new hemlines".[201] While these are just three examples from *Vogue* magazine, they are part of a wider trend in fashion branding during the 1960s and 1970s that connected to the notion of newness and modernity of Europe and made a point of presenting this to their readers. This concept is also recognized by Becky Conekin. In the 1960s, London haute couture and mass-produced fashion quickly adapted "the youth cult to mainstream fashion"[202]. This recognized the shift in British culture from the mid-1950s to the late 1960s, when Britain was no longer an Empire and the post-war welfare state redesigned class and culture. Conekin attributes this to an increase in education, where local government's education grants provided a source of education for those who normally would not have had the opportunity to do so. An influx in education and artistic minds created the culture of the late 1960s, which fashion embraced and celebrated.[203] By the mid-1960s,

---

[201] "Your Prettiest New Looks in Paris Fashion", *Vogue*, September 15, 1969; "Paris Hemlines: Straight talk on the new fashion", *Vogue*, September 15, 1970; "Paris Now: The sexy looks of the new hemlines", *Vogue*, March 15, 1971.
[202] Becky E. Conekin, "From Haughty to Nice: How British Fashion Images Changed from the 1950s to the 1960s." *Photography and Culture* 3, no. 3 (2010): 283-96. Accessed November 14, 2018. doi:10.2752/175145109x12804957025552, 289.
[203] Conekin, "From Haught to Nice", 289.

Conekin states that the narrative of the radical break with tradition and history was beginning to firmly establish itself. Mary Quant, 1966: "Once only the Rich, the Establishment set the fashion. Now…they represent the whole new spirit that is present-day Britain—a classless spirit that has grown up out of the Second World War…they are the Mods."[204] While Conekin focuses on the transformation of British society during this period, and the impact it had on fashion trends, as suggested by *Vogue*, the embrace of the new and modern Europe was just one of the factors in shifts in culture.

Cosmopolitanism in British society during this period can be seen in two forms. In a direct form, it appears in arts festivals and exhibitions, the purpose of which was to promote a blending of cultures and the creation of one larger, shared culture. The Fanfare for Europe was created to celebrate a joining of nations and sharing of cultures, much like the Commonwealth Art Festival had in 1965. These festivals and art exchange programs are evidence of cultural policies that were sponsored by the government and/or various museums and provided an atmosphere to encourage shifts in cultural identity. In an indirect form, cosmopolitanism is seen in European films, fashion, and jewelry. While an openness to Europe may not have been outwardly present, the access to and embrace of European cinema

---

[204] Conekin, "From Haught to Nice", 293. While youth culture is not discussed or focused on in this thesis, there are some articles that discuss the role of youth culture in shaping culture within the 1960s, including fashion. For further research, see: Andrew August, "Gender and 1960s Youth Culture: The Rolling Stones and the New Woman." *Contemporary British History* 23, no. 1 (April 7, 2009): 79-100, Ruth Adams, "The Englishness of English Punk: Sex Pistols, Subculture, and Nostalgia." *Popular Music and Society* 31, no. 4 (October 2008): 469-88, Jon Garland, Keith Gildart, et al., "Youth Culture, Popular Music and the End of 'Consensus' in Post-War Britain", *Contemporary British History*, 26, no. 3, (September 2012): 265-271, and Matthew Worley, "Shot By Both Sides: Punk, Politics and the End of 'Consensus'." *Contemporary British History* 26, no. 3 (September 2012): 333-54. For discussions around other movements in youth culture during the 1950s and 1960s, see: Jim Gledhill, "White Heat, Guide Blue: The Girl Guide Movement in the 1960s." *Contemporary British History* 27, no. 1 (October 9, 2013): 65-84, and David Fowler, "From Jukebox Boys to Revolting Students: Richard Hoggart and the Study of British Youth Culture." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 10, no. 1 (2007): 73–84. For early discussions on youth culture, albeit in American youth, see: Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States", *American Sociological Review*, 16, (October 1942): 604-616, which pairs well with Sarah Mills, "Be Prepared: Communism and the Politics of Scouting in 1950s Britain." *Contemporary British History* 25, no. 3 (June 25, 2011): 429-50, Helena Mills, "Using the Personal to Critique the Popular: Women's Memories of 1960s Youth." *Contemporary British History* 30, no. 4 (July 12, 2016): 463-83, and David Muggleton, "From Classlessness to Clubculture: A Genealogy of Post-war British Youth Cultural Analysis." *Nordic Journal of Youth Research* 13, no. 2 (2005): 205–19. An article that discusses French influences on youth culture during the 1960s is Chris Tinker, "Shaping 1960s Youth in Britain and France: Fabulous and Salut Les Copains." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 14, no. 6 (2011): 641-57.

by a minority of Britons, and clothing tastes—embraced by many British designers of all classes—shows that Britain was already embracing other cultures and adopting to them as their own. European clothing and jewelry trends emerged in the Nineteenth Century and gained momentum throughout the Twentieth Century, becoming incorporated into British culture. Another indirect form of cosmopolitanism came in the development of international package holidays, which like cinema, exposed Britons to outside cultures, and provided easier access to European cultural integration. Whilst cultural schemes that were sponsored by the government and heritage industry sought to shape British culture towards a more European based identity of a single culture with individual subcategories; these ideas were building upon established forms of cosmopolitanism, albeit in subtle forms, that were already firmly rooted in Britain.

Nostalgia

In a contrast to the role of cosmopolitanism on British culture, occurring at the same time were nostalgic influences in popular culture, such as the traditional Victoriana designs and aesthetics that catapulted Laura Ashley into high fashion in the 1970s. Outside of fashion, nostalgia was also found on television screens and in the cinemas, where images of Imperial Britain contrasted with the pro-European views of Heath and Callaghan.

The period dramas of the 1970s shook aside images of Anglo-Europeanism and allowed Britons to relive the height of empire and Britain's power, strong identity, and global influence, providing for escapism and images of British exceptionalism. Appearing across television screens from 1970-1975, *Upstairs, Downstairs* became one of the more popular shows of the decade, not just in Britain but in America and Europe, and has remained a cultural classic from the decade. Like the modern equivalent *Downton Abbey* (ITV, 2010-2015), *Upstairs, Downstairs* is less of a dramatized historical piece and more of a nuanced drama examining the social realism of the aristocratic Edwardians and their staff. Spanning from the beginning of the Edwardian era until the Great Depression, the fictional characters mix with actual historic figures and events; but the focus is always set in the fictional household: the upstairs family and their downstairs servants. The traditions of the Edwardian upper classes are shown in such detail, that when contrasted with the Seventies politics of Heath, Wilson, and Callaghan, a sense of British exceptionalism and the lost great past is prominently on display. The power of British war films in the 1950s and Edwardian television in the 1970s is its ability to glamourize the past, giving rose-tinted versions of

events or daily life, making it more appealing to modern audiences. In a sense, creating a spectacle of a Britain when she was at the height of her empire, a welcomed image by the everyday Briton who was beginning to feel the loss of their own identity or perceived global position; especially following Britain's membership of the European Economic Community. As Carl Freedman discusses, *Upstairs, Downstairs* showcased the "internal national self-image of Englishness" and "the house at 165 Eaton Place comes to serve as a figure for an England that never quite existed"; and that the show's popularity is due to it reflecting "an England that well corresponds to what England in the Seventies dearly wished itself to have been and perhaps even to be once again".[205] The role of Empire and the Second World War is also the main theme of two popular books from the era: Evelyn Waugh's *Brideshead Revisited: The Sacred and Profane Memories of Captain Charles Rider* (1945) and John Fowles' *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969), showing that cinema and television were not the only forms of escapism into the British past.[206]

Government-sponsored events and cultural policies, such as the Fanfare for Europe in 1973 and town twinning schemes in the 1960s and 1970s, was hoped to help transition British culture and mindsets to a more Anglo-European identity, and less of an Imperial or Anglo-Commonwealth identity-based culture. This was, however, challenged by the popularity of films and television that idealized the past.

This chapter has already discussed the role of British war films in the 1950s and 1960s that showcased British exceptionalism via wartime escapades, and in the 1970s, television was also used to showcase the British exceptionalism as a method for coping with the current political and social climate. Shown during miner's strikes and power cuts, three-day work weeks and political stalemates, *Upstairs, Downstairs* allowed viewers to return to their idealized past, with defined roles in society—and in return provided a defined sense of identity. The popularity of *Upstairs, Downstairs* suggests that the on-screen Britain was one that Britain in the 1970s was striving to return to. As Heath had said at the beginning of the Fanfare for Europe in January 1973, Britons could "look forward with excitement on the venture they were embarking on"; yet the great adventure wasn't translating well in the mid Seventies.[207] As mentioned, during the early 1970s, the nation was met with economic unease

---

[205] Carl Freedman, "England as Ideology: From 'Upstairs, Downstairs' to 'A Room with a View.'" *Cultural Critique*, no. 17 (1990): 79–106. https://doi.org/10.2307/1354140, 82.

[206] To note, both of these books would appear on screen in 1981. *Brideshead Revisited* as an 11-hour tv serial, and *The French Lieutenant's Woman* in cinemas.

[207] "Fanfare for Europe: Message from the Prime Minister", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.

and fuel shortages. This was caused by several things. High rates of inflation had caused issues for the British economy, and a cap on pay for public services led to unrest amongst unions, including the mining unions who controlled much of the nation's fuel. In 1972, a miner's strike lasting seven weeks resulted in power shortages and the prime minster declaring a state of emergency.[208] The grim reality of Britain in the early Seventies was not necessarily reflected on television screens, however. Besides *Upstairs, Downstairs*, documentaries such as BBC's *The British Empire* (1972) and Thames Television's 1973 *The World At War* largely depicted Britain as a global power, and in a positive light.[209] As mentioned before, the nostalgia for the greater past is evident in a period of decline. Whereas the popularity of wartime cinema in the 1950s occurred while Britain's global role was in question, its success was due to it giving the public a sense of importance and a reminder of their greatness. *Upstairs, Downstairs* can be said to do the same thing.

In what can be considered the opposite end of the television spectrum, the comedy *Are You Being Served?* was a parody of the British social system, often making fun of the upper classes while poking fun at the working class; and using sexual innuendo as often as possible. By mixing low brow humor with subtle criticism of the upper classes, where *Upstairs, Downstairs* romanticized the British social classes and imperial past, *Are You Being Served?* reflected more contemporary views of British society stuck in the past. This is in many ways a contradiction to the themes produced by *Upstairs, Downstairs*, where the height of Britain and her influence was demonstrated by a class system in which each person knew their place and their role, and more importantly, their duty and steadfastness, and *never complain, never explain* mentality. As both shows were immensely popular, the satirical *Are You Being Served?* and its views of the working class compared to the idolization of the upper classes and social order in *Upstairs, Downstairs* depicts identity and concepts of Britishness in transition during the Seventies. Britain had joined the Common Market, seen as the future and way for prosperity, but had also endured strikes and high unemployment. As Britons once again retreated to the imagined safety of the past to develop her identity and redefine Britishness, these two shows demonstrate the differing views on the reality of Britain.

---

[208] "Emergency as big blackout looms near", *Newcastle Journal*, 9 February 1972.
[209] Along with television, films such as *The Go-Between* (1971) and Agatha Christie's *Murder on the Orient Express* (1974) and *Death on the Nile (1978)* also provided escapism into the imperial British past.

In closer comparing the two television shows, *Are You Being Served?* depicts contemporary 1970s Britain, and Britain is categorized as being old fashioned, out of date, and not in touch with a more modern, open society as suggested by cultural polices aimed at Anglo-European integration and cosmopolitanism. *Are You Being Served?* instead suggests a Victorian definition of Britain; which is similar to *Upstairs, Downstairs*, whose characters' views and morals were formed under Victoria, which suggests a version of Britain as cold and uncompromising and placing duty over emotion; a contrast to the youth culture and spirit of the 1960s. Within *Upstairs, Downstairs*, the way many of the characters are depicted lack sympathy from the viewer, yet in later seasons which are set following World War One and the Great Depression, the characters are depicted as mourning the loss of their way of life, a subtle recognition of Britain's change in global position and influence. It can also be interpreted that using escapism into the past by *Upstairs, Downstairs*, skepticism or discomfort around British membership to the Common Market and the promotion of Anglo-European integration is further demonstrated. The confusing or uncomfortable views of Britain, her influence, and her position in the world is reflected by the use of wartime cinema and nostalgic television shows that asserted a clear understand of Britain and her position. Retreating to the past and previous views of glorious Britain and her influence during a transient political period was not confined to television or literature.

The following chapter of this thesis will be devoted to exploring and examining periods when cultural policies seemed to align with governmental policies and practices, and how government priorities could be seen to affect the role of the arts and cultural policies and their interactions with society. As this chapter has shown, there were also strands of popular culture that conflicted with these narratives. The discussion around cosmopolitanism and the notion that an openness to other cultures and peoples enriches one's own country and contains views of belonging to a single community both support the views of Heath as presented in the Fanfare for Europe (that a joint Anglo-European culture was an aspect of modern Britain) by showing that European culture, in the form of cinema and fashion, was positively influencing British society; but also contradicts this by asserting that influences from abroad in shaping British culture had long been the case and was not a new response to European membership. Nostalgia also obstructs the cultural policies that promoted an integration of European (and earlier, Commonwealth) culture with British culture due to its successful commercialization of Imperial Britain. As with the discussion of Laura Ashely, the popularity of *Upstairs, Downstairs* and documentaries that discussed British exceptionalism

in the Second World War and in empire promoted a version of Britain that contrasted with cultural policies and government-sponsored festivals aimed at promoting Britain within Europe. The discussions around nostalgia shows that there were still aspects of society that had not attached to official narratives on modernity and newness, and failed to look towards Europe for prosperity. Coinciding with these themes of nostalgia and a remembering of Imperial Britain, were contemporary writers whose experiences with colonization, empire, and immigration emerged in literary circles within Britain, providing discourse on the real effects of post-war politics and how Britain was being reshaped.

3.5: Emerging Commonwealth Literary Culture in Britain

As a result of the British Nationality Act in 1948 and more widespread immigration from Commonwealth and Colonial territories, society in the 1950s saw an emerging Commonwealth literary culture, and discussion on its impact on British culture was beginning to be discussed. London in the two decades following the Second World War began to appear as a literary center for Commonwealth authors, particularly West Indian and Caribbean authors, as well as those from Africa.[210] Literary critic Francis Wyndham commented in the late 1950s that for publishers towards the end of the decade, it was becoming popular to publish Commonwealth authors, from what he called "the colonial margins of old Empires".[211] Wyndham remarked that new emerging voices from Africa, the West Indies, and India, along with others from the Caribbean, were adding a new dramatic flair to British publishing, with many Commonwealth writers finding success.[212] Some of the authors who were raised in the Empire/ Commonwealth and found acclaim include: Chinua Achebe, Nigeria, *Things Fall Apart* (1958); Amos Tutola, Nigeria, *The Palm Wine Drinkard and His Palm Wine Tapster in Deads' Town* (1952), Doris Lessing, Rhodesia/ Zimbabwe, *The Grass is Singing* (1950); Anita Desai, India, *Cry, The Peacock* (1963) and *Clear Light of Day* (1980); Sam Selvon, Trinidad, *The Lonely* Londoners (1956) and George Lamming, Barbados, *In the Castle of my Skin* (1953) and *The Emigrants* (1954). Unsurprisingly, many of these novels discussed or had themes of empire and decolonization, immigration, and the affects this had on culture and society.

---

[210] Gail Low, "At Home? Discoursing on the Commonwealth at the 1965 Commonwealth Arts Festival." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 48, no. 1 (March 2013): 97–111. Accessed February 10, 2020. doi:10.1177/0021989412471838.

[211] Low, "At Home?", 21. This quote is taken from an interview given by Wyndham originally given to *Harpers Bazaar* in 1958.

[212] Low, "At Home?", 21.

Perhaps one of the more well-known and recognized pieces of literature to emerge from this period is Chinua Achebe's 1958 novel *Things Fall Apart*. *Things Fall Apart* takes place in Nigeria in the Nineteenth Century and shows the transition within a community from the pre-colonial era, focusing largely on the period which included the arrival of white, Christian missionaries, and the devastating affects colonization had on indigenous cultures. While Achebe's novel depicts the transition from pre-colonial Africa to a colonized territory within the British Empire, many of the novels published during this period discuss the impact of empire in more present terms and situations. Doris Lessing's 1950 novel *The Grass is Singing* is set in South Africa shortly after the formal start of apartheid in the late 1940s. Discussing the racial and colonial policies of South Africa following the Second World War, *The Grass is Singing* was published a decade before South Africa withdrew membership from the Commonwealth over pressures from other members of their racial policies; the effects of which are shown in shaping the lives of both white and black South Africans. The impact of colonial polices is a common thread in other pieces of literature from this period.

Samuel Selvon's 1956 novel *The Lonely Londoners* is a social critique of the experience had by Caribbean immigrants in 1950s London. Many of the characters featured can be considered part of the Windrush Generation, having arrived in Britain in response to the 1948 Nationality Act; and concepts of cultural differences and the realities of racism within 1950s Britain towards non-white members of the Empire are shown.[213] This is also explored in George Lamming's 1954 novel *The Emigrants*. *The Emigrants* chronicles the experiences of West Indians in Great Britain, including the marginalization of members of the Empire and the realization of being perceived as lesser, second class citizens and their role within Britain. The effects of colonization on identity and displacement are also discussed in Lamming's earlier novel, *In the Castle of My Skin*, which looks at colonial experiences in Barbados through the eyes of a child in school. Another, later piece that has themes of Empire and decolonization is Anita Desai's *Clear Light of Day*. While sections of *Clear Light of Day* are set during the partition of India, the novel does not necessarily discuss the impact this had on life, yet it is still a larger background presence. The themes found within these pieces of literature reflect an emerging discussion on the role of colonization,

---

[213] For a contemporary analysis on the Windrush Generation, including politics and oral histories, see: Amelia Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal: Exposing the Hostile Environment* (2020), Colin Grant, *Homecoming: Voices of the Windrush Generation* (2020), David Matthews, *Voices of the Windrush Generation: The real story told by the people themselves* (2020), and Trevor Philips, *Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain* (1999).

and subsequently decolonization, across Britain and the Commonwealth. While these works sit on the margins of society and are not representative of the types of literature that was being read by the majority of Britons, it does show evidence of Britain's cultural milieu responding to decolonization and the loss of empire, and the growth of the Commonwealth.

This emerging literary voice from the Commonwealth is not new, however. Following the establishment of the BBC Empire Service in 1932, a topical program from the Caribbean came into existence as *Calling the West Indies* in 1943.[214] Shortly following the launch of the BBC Caribbean service, BBC producer Una Marson, who was originally from Jamaica, created the program *Caribbean Voices*, which was inspired by Marson's love of poetry and literature, and was a weekly feature in the *West Indies* program. *Caribbean Voices* featured short stories and poems from lesser or unknown Caribbean authors and served as a wider introduction into literary themes and works from the Empire, which would soon transition into the Commonwealth.[215] Both programs were launched as the first rounds of major immigration from within the Empire occurred, and shortly before the 1948 Nationality Act, but would not have a long run time. *Caribbean Voices* ended in 1958, and the BBC Caribbean service ended in the 1970s (but was revitalized the following decade).[216] Along with the Commonwealth Institute that allowed for Commonwealth artists to display their works, *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, established in Leeds in 1965, provides an internationally recognized academic body to discuss Commonwealth writings, cultural and political discourse, and postcolonial literature, theory, and colonial discourse.[217] These platforms, while small in number, were essential in growing Commonwealth literature within Britain.

In addition to these works by Commonwealth authors, there were also pieces of contemporary literature that explored decolonization, the role of the Commonwealth, and in some cases, the influence of American culture. Some of the first novels to fictionalize the break-up of the British Empire focused on the aftermath of the Second World War throughout

---

[214] David Hendy, "Caribbean Voices - History of the BBC." BBC News. BBC. Accessed February 24, 2020. https://www.bbc.com/historyofthebbc/100-voices/people-nation-empire/caribbean-voices.

[215] Hendy, "Caribbean Voices".

[216] Hendy, "Caribbean Voices".

[217] "The Journal of Commonwealth Literature." SAGE Publications Ltd, February 22, 2020. https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal/journal-commonwealth-literature. For a brief overview of *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, see: Matthew Whittle, "Afterword: The Journal of Commonwealth Literature, Postcolonial Studies, and the Provinces." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 50, no. 3 (2015): 391–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989415596562.

the Empire, discussing the complicated and messy process of decolonization, and in some cases, discussed Britain's political desire to strengthen its imperial networks through the growing Commonwealth. Some of the authors who explored British imperial decline, including Gerald Hanley, William Golding, Anthony Burgess, and Alan Sillitoe, "provide a self-aware commentary on how decolonization and the Second World War disrupted established colonial hierarchies surrounding class and race."[218] Examples of these books that depict decolonization and a shift from British influence in culture and politics are: *The Malayan Trilogy* (1956-59), *The Quiet American* (1955), *At Fever Pitch* (1959) and *Academic Year* (1955). These books both suggest a British scheme to establish a common culture within the Commonwealth and the dwindling Empire, as well as a British inability to prevent the Americanization of a fragmented nation. Also noticed in these books is a shift from the glamorization of the colonial era to a more realistic discussion on the atrocities of colonialism, including segregation, repression, and abuse.[219] While these books are small in number they, like the works published by Commonwealth authors as previously discussed, provide insight into minor shifts within popular culture that provides evidence of Britain's artistic community responding to the loss of Empire, the growth of the Commonwealth, and how this was being felt in former colonial territories.

As discussed heavily throughout this thesis thus far, decolonization played a central role in British policy and decision making, and the development of the Commonwealth would have a profound impact on Britain's cultural policies during this period. The 1950s and 1960s were dominated with decolonization and independence ceremonies, and membership of the Commonwealth only continued to grow. As a result of widespread immigration from various corners of the Empire, literary voices began to emerge from Commonwealth nations, with strong themes of colonization, displacement, and identity. The imperial experiences from these authors and broadcasters added to a growing conversation on the impact of empire to those outside of Britain, helping show the reality of colonization on indigenous cultures.

---

[218] Matthew Whittle. *Post-War British Literature and the "End of Empire"*. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 25. Whittle comments that "Reappraisals of an imperial imagery that are evident in *The Counsel at Sunset, Lord of the Flies, Free Fall, The Malayan Trilogy, Key to the Door* disrupt the prevailing characterization of literature of decolonization as articulating a single-voiced eulogy for the Empire." (61) Whittle explains that Victorian literature focused on the "savagery" of the colonial territories to assert Imperial dominance and intellect over the conquered lands and defend Europe and Britain's position in the world. Examples of this include Joseph Conrad's *The Heart of Darkness* from 1899.

[219] Whittle, *Post-War British Literature,* 69.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored different avenues of influence upon popular culture during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. This prominently included the role of nostalgia, for both Imperial Britain, but also for Britain during World War Two. The cinematic depictions of Britain at War, albeit presented in a nostalgic or positive light, lead to some of the more popular films of the 1950s and 1960s. Paired with wartime commemorations, for many, the Second World War never fully retreated into the past. This occurred during periods in which British influence abroad was being called into question, such as during periods of decolonization and the loss of empire, but also during periods of a strengthening and uniting Europe, and a resurgence of influence from West Germany on the arena of global politics. Popular television shows depicting Britain at war and Imperial Britain broadcast into Briton's homes, at a time when high rates of inflation had caused issues for the British economy, and a cap on pay for public services, and widespread shortages. A sense of British exceptionalism as told through the days of yore contrasted with lackluster and uninspiring politicians. Outside of nostalgia, there were smaller influences of Commonwealth literature, with many contemporary writers producing works that addressed and responded to the realities of empire and immigration. This revealed a growing understanding of how Commonwealth culture contributed to new, modern approaches to British society and cultural policies.

The rest of this thesis will focus on cultural policies that responded to, or where shaped by, politics over this period. This includes the development of CEMA and the Arts Council, the use of cultural festivals that aligned with government priorities and aspirations, and art exhibitions curated to showcase Anglo-Commonwealth and Anglo-European identities.

<center>**Chapter Four: Cultural Policy, CEMA, and the Arts Council**</center>

Introduction

This, and subsequent chapters, will build upon the political and cultural contexts of the previous two chapters to show how cultural policies were established, developed, and understood by governments. During an era of deep and profound changes, for both Britain and Europe, we can see examples of cultural policies and the arts aligning with governmental policies and visions.

This chapter provides an understanding of the themes and research questions explored within the thesis and will also develop an understanding on how cultural policy functions within Britain. This chapter will explain how the origins of a contemporary cultural policy linking the arts with the State was developed during the Second World War, and the impact this had on establishing official State arts organizations and governing bodies in the decades following. The chapter will further develop this notion by exploring two semi-independent arts organizations in Britain—the Welsh Committee and the Scottish Committee—and show how these organizations used their platforms to promote their own nations as separate and unique from England. Included in this chapter's discussion will be an analysis of the various methods of Anglo-European cultural integration, looking at policies outside of the "high" arts sectors. These discussions will reveal how the arts can and were used to create ideals of identity, at times reflecting or aligning with government priorities and aspirations.

While the time period for this project is 1945-1975, discussions on cultural policy within this chapter will engage with Britain's cultural policies during the Second World War owing to the wartime mobilization of culture but will not extend its discussions past 1975; this also applies to the roles of the Welsh Committee and Scottish Committee when acting as agents of the Arts Council of Great Britain.

4.1: *Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts* **and the Wartime Mobilization of Culture in Britain**

Building upon Kevin Mulcahy's definition of cultural policy as "the sum of a government's activities with respect to the arts, the humanities, and the heritage", the origins of a modern cultural policy that brought the arts under the jurisdiction of the State in Britain are linked to the outbreak of the Second World War.[220] The wartime mobilization of culture

---

[220] Mulcahy, "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches," 320.

was borne out of a necessity to remind Britain of her value and importance during a period of intense conflict and social upheaval, which was achieved by curating exhibitions and sponsoring artistic events that celebrated traditional British culture. This also allowed for the maintaining of a popular artistic presence during wartime. Prior to the Second World War, an official arts policy was relatively non-existent, with much of the arts being funded by royal and other prestigious patronages. The only official government policies that supported cultural practices were the 1891 Museums and Gymnasiums Act and the Public Libraries Act in 1892, which when combined, established public museums and libraries.[221] The next major development in government policy supporting the arts occurred in December 1939/ January 1940 with the establishment of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA). The creation of CEMA can today be viewed as the foundation of modern British cultural policy, artistic promotion, and preservation.[222]

CEMA was established "to preserve cultural traditions and activities" during the Second World War, and to "extend the accessibility of music, drama and the other arts to the provinces".[223] This concept is noted in the arts policies that provided the basis for CEMA's arts activities in the early 1940s. One of CEMA's guidelines helps define the term accessibility, in this context, by stating that in providing exhibitions, "it [CEMA] must stay clear of the big cities and to concentrate on those [people living] in towns or villages which are too small or too poor to possess an art gallery of their own".[224] The notion of taking the arts into some of the more remote areas that did not benefit from a regular arts program or arts events was discussed in a 1941 CEMA press conference, which again explained one of

---

[221] *HL Deb 27 May 1895 vol 34 cc327-30; overview of the Museums and Gymnasiums Act, and its following debates and implementations.*

[222] While noting that the National Trust was established long before WWII in 1895, preservation in this sense applies to exhibitions and performative arts; not to preserving property or landscapes. The role of the National Trust in preserving British heritage and cultivating a sense of nostalgia for Imperial Britain, while hugely successful, does not apply to the context of this thesis or discussion. According to Robert Hewison, the creation of CEMA "mark[ed] the beginning of the modern period in official British cultural policy." This quote is taken from Huw David Jones' "'An Art of Our Own': State Patronage of the Visual Arts in Wales, 1945–1967",45.

[223] Michael Green, Michael Wilding, and Richard Hoggart. *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*. (Paris, France: UNESCO, 1970), 9. This report is an assessment of cultural policy in England, Wales, and Scotland. Attempts to outline the overall shape of British policy focus primarily on England, due to Wales and Scotland needing an increased focus on their traditional heritage, and not having the time or space to devote to this in the study. England is the prime example used. The report gives extensive detail into five main topics: growth and main methods of public support and planning, the training and patronage of the arts, traditional media and institutions for the appreciation and dissemination of the arts, the mass media and the arts; and proposed new ideas for the field. The report was written by Michael Green and Michael Wilding with consolations from Richard Hoggart.

[224] TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities.

the purpose and benefits of CEMA during the wartime. The press conference stated that CEMA has "the double function of maintaining the highest standard of the arts and of taking them to those who need their refreshment in the wartime."[225] The view of taking the arts to those who needed an artistic "refreshment" the most is also discussed in a retrospective article published in April 1945 and written by CEMA's Director of Music Reginald Jacques. In the article, Jacques explains how CEMA was created and for what wartime purposes. He states that "CEMA was born of necessity in the black days of January 1940… [by a group of people who] felt that it was urgently necessary to keep alive the Arts in wartime. So, they took immediate action"[226] This information also echoes an earlier public service film produced by the National Films Council of the Department of Education in 1942. Presented by RA Butler, the president of the Board of Education, the short film, *"CEMA"*, explains in simple terms, directed for the public, the purpose of CEMA. Butler comments that CEMA (which he pronounces as sea-ma) "started in the first winter of the war to bring pleasure in the highest forms of inspiration" to the millions suffering during the blackouts and Blitz.[227] CEMA, Butler explains, takes music and the arts into factories, towns, and other areas of the nation that are isolated from entertainment, which he calls a "wartime inspiration of bringing our best…to cheer Britons on to better times."[228]

In his 1945 article, Reginald Jacques similarly explains how theatre and music was mobilized to provide entertainment in bomb shelters, canteens, and hospitals; and how many actors (like Sybil Thorndike and Laurence Olivier) travelled across the country at great risk to bring enjoyment to Britons, which Jacques felt was the true nature of CEMA.[229] According to Jacques, one of the ways CEMA was able to achieve these aspirations of providing artistic merriment and refreshment was by providing financial support to voluntary organizations and sponsored activities.[230] This is also discussed in an article from *The Stage*, where it is commented that CEMA was also established to financially assist "activities in music, painting, and drama, which it was feared might otherwise have died under war-time restrictions".[231] We see this emphasis on the mobilization and accessibility to the arts during

---

[225] TNA, BW 2/616, CEMA Press Conference. The press conference is undated but is held in a file dated 1941.
[226] Reginald Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts." *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 93, no. 4690 (April 27, 1945): 275–84. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41362933; 276.
[227] The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*. United Kingdom, 1942.Video. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6FDfP2L6Fak
[228] The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*.
[229] Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts".
[230] Green, *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*, 9.
[231] "The CEMA", *The Stage*. 25 April 1940.

the war in the film *"CEMA"*, also, where the purpose of CEMA is demonstrated in constantly evolving programs, concerts, exhibitions featuring collections of paintings, and town planning projects for post-war.[232] From these sources, we are able to understand how CEMA was developed during the war to provide artistic respite from the conflict. And while RA Butler explained that CEMA was developed to provide a refreshment and "bit of cheer" to Britons suffering during the war, we can also detect elements of how wartime propaganda was used in conjunction with the arts, showing that the arts were already being politicized to align with government priorities and views, promoting the rightness or necessity for war.

Wartime propaganda being used to combine the arts in promoting a perceived necessity for the war is demonstrated in the 1942 state-produced film *"CEMA"*. This government-sponsored film was shows the audience attending a CEMA-funded public exhibition on paintings, during which a member of the public asks the exhibition curator "what is the point of this art?", to which the curator passionately replies "we all know what we're fighting against, but…sometimes we forget what we're fighting for", later saying that if Britain was not fighting in the Second World War (the curator just says 'this war'), Britons wouldn't be free to "look at what we want to", asserting to the public that traditional British culture was also at risk.[233] This phrasing connects directly the Ministry of Information's views on wartime propaganda that were to "extend British culture abroad and explain British policy" with the founder's aspirations for CEMA, which was to promote and maintain British culture at home.[234]

Despite being its own, separate entity, CEMA was established alongside Wartime Britain's Ministry of Information. The Ministry of Information (MOI), established the day after Britain declared war on Germany, on September 4, 1939, was based loosely on World War One's propaganda efforts.[235] In the years succeeding November 1918, until 1939 no official organization existed that disseminated information and propaganda for the British government.[236] Following Britain's declaration of war on Germany, Prime Minister Chamberlain told the House of Commons that the MOI must exist to both provide information to the British public that keeps them informed and also in a positive mood; and

[232] The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*.

[233] The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*.

[234] Cedric Larson, "The British Ministry of Information." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1941): 412–31. https://doi.org/jstor.org/stable/2745133, 415.

[235] Larson, "The British Ministry of Information.", 412.

[236] Larson, "The British Ministry of Information", 412.

negate any propaganda spread by German officials.[237] Within the MOI were four departments, one of which directly connected with CEMA's interests. This division was divided into four groups all focusing on the arts and culture. These included: film (an example would be the State-produced film *"CEMA"*, discussed earlier), radio and communications to help fight the "war of words", literature and the arts, and "other productions" (not much is known on this department).[238] The inclusion of arts and culture into the MOI provides evidence of early government cultural policies that used culture and the arts for political means—using government funding to promote government ideas. In this example, we see the mobilization of the arts and culture during wartime to both keep British morale high, but also, to spread a narrative that was consistently providing examples of "what we are fighting for", as seen in *"CEMA"*. Other examples of this can be found in period newspaper and magazine articles, as explained previously above.

CEMA: Funding

While CEMA provided the means necessary to send the arts across Britain, funding for the organization was provided by a grant from the Ministry of Education. Reginald Jacques discusses how CEMA was able to secure funding to establish the council. Prior to funding from the Treasury, CEMA was granted funding from the Pilgrim Trust, initially requesting £5000 for the encouragement and development of music and the arts.[239] The Pilgrim Trust, which was established in 1930 to provide the funds to support Great Britain and Ireland's "most urgent needs" on preserving Britain's heritage, instead provided £25,000, followed by the Treasury adding £1 for £1, which Jacques described "as a sum of money, not great, but as a gesture [funds from the Treasury], of considerable significance."[240] A committee was then formed with Lord Macmillan and Dr Thomas Jones as Chairman and Vice-Chairman. State funding for the arts was secured and "CEMA was born."[241] In March 1942, the Pilgrim Trust withdrew its financial support having seen the success of CEMA in achieving its aims and gave a final parting gift of £12,500. Removing support from an

---

[237] Larson, "The British Ministry of Information", 416
[238] Larson, "The British Ministry of Information",415-418. The four divisions of the MOI were: press relations, news and censorship; publicity; cultural; and administrative.
[239] Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts", 276.
[240] Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts", 276. The sum of £25,000 is also confirmed as having been granted by The Pilgrim Trust in a 1940 article from The Stage, which also discusses the role of CEMA in Wartime Britain. "The CEMA", *The Stage*. 25 April 1940. For more on The Pilgrim Trust, see: "History," The Pilgrim Trust, accessed December 7, 2021, https://www.thepilgrimtrust.org.uk/about-us/history/.
[241] Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts", 276.

organization that had proved it was self-sufficient was standard practice for the Pilgrim Trust and should be read as a compliment on the successes of CEMA's programs and outreach, not as a negative view towards CEMA and its work. From then onwards CEMA was financed entirely by the Treasury under the leadership of its new chairman, Lord Keynes.[242]

Responses to CEMA's Programs

CEMA's programs are evidence of cultural policy in practice. Firstly, CEMA was established to make art, music, and theatre more accessible to ordinary Britons. Travelling theatrical productions and music companies allowed Britons outside of large cities to experience these forms of entertainment, which Reginald Jacques commented upon as being the true nature and purpose of CEMA. As mentioned earlier, CEMA's exhibition policies noted a desire to concentrate their programing and efforts on areas of the nation that were poorer and/ or did not have their own art presence. An example of CEMA's success can be found in official reports from CEMA. In 1940, it was estimated that there was a total attendance of at least 270,000 for the "Art of the People" exhibitions, which when considering this related to Britons outside of major cities, suggests the immense degree of local interest in CEMA's exhibitions and presence.[243] Other reports attest to the public's interest in CEMA, with reports showing the abundant local support for the exhibitions, concerts, and theatrical productions, with CEMA officials specifically noting that these events had been particularly successful when touring bombed areas of the nation.[244]

Using CEMA as an example of governmental cultural policy is also evidenced in the MOI-sponsored film depicting Britons attending music concerts held in town halls, local theatre groups, and discussions about the purpose of art at painting exhibitions. In making their programs more accessible to Britons outside of major cities, it also maintained British culture due to its appreciation and understanding. The preservation and maintenance of British culture during the Second World War is explained in the inclusion of propaganda at the end of *"CEMA"*, when the curator explains to the exhibition patron (and the public) that the ability to appreciate art and "look at what we want to look at" was a reason for being at war.[245] This inclusion in the government-sponsored film can be seen as an attempt by a

---

[242] Jacques, "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts", 276. A table and discussion around the funding for the Arts Council following 1945 can be found in the next section, Government and the Arts.

[243] TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities.

[244] TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities.

[245] The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*.

government body to utilize culture to fit a political narrative. Here, art appreciation and patronage are viewed as a part of Britishness that would, in the context of 1940, would be lost if Britain did not survive the conflict.

There are numerous other examples of CEMA being used to support the development and accessibility of the arts and British culture during wartime, often found in magazines such as *The Stage* and *Tatler. Tatler* remarked in October 1943 that CEMA was now funding Shakespearian plays, and that thanks to the government funding, plays and ballets "of the highest standard of art in wartime" would be sent to worker's hostels around the country, the first being a production of *Twelfth Night* in Coventry.[246] This example from *Tatler* reflects CEMA's statements that being at war would not affect the quality of the work produced. Another article from *The Stage* in 1943 remarks that, thanks to CEMA and its funding, music and drama venues across the country have been able to reopen, or remain open; and that for many towns, music and the arts had become more accessible during wartime than before. A specific example given in this article was the conclusion that over 300 music concerts had been arranged, along with at least 50 art exhibitions, under CEMA. As with many articles published in this period, authors are adamant to note that the CEMA is only made possible due to government support and funds.[247]It is also worth noting that CEMA officials asserted that the presence of the War had not made any impact on the ability to "curate first class exhibitions and secure the necessary artworks needed", which was made possible again by the funding CEMA received and can also explain the popularity of the programs.[248]

Robert Hewison states that because of the role culture (which Hewison describes as heritage and the arts) plays in supporting national identities and society, government support and intervention towards funding the arts is justified.[249] The examples previously listed provide insight into the reasons behind government intervention in the arts: by funding arts programs that promote classic British culture, such as Shakespeare and Oscar Wilde, British composers, and local amateur artists; an alignment of arts and culture with the needs of the

---

[246] "Twelfth Night: The Walter Hudd Production for CEMA at Coventry", *The Tatler*, 6 October 1943. The comments about CEMA's ability to provide first rate exhibitions and events can be found at: TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities.

[247] "CEMA", *The Stage*, 27 May 1943.

[248] TNA, BW 2/616: Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Minutes, 1941-1959. Paper LXXII: CEMA's Art Activities. This file includes "The public's interest", which includes reports sent from CEMA that "testify abundantly the interest aroused by the exhibitions, an interest that has definitely increased since the war began, and has been particularly successful in bombed areas."

[249] Robert Hewison, *Cultural Capital: The Rise and Fall of Creative Britain*. (London: Verso, 2014), 29.

State is met, and the events hosted by CEMA could be used as a way to explain the necessity of being involved in war, to preserve traditional Britain and her culture. By exploring the cultural policies and arts programs during eras of profound change for both Britain and Europe, we can find examples of how cultural policies can be suggested as aligning with government policies, visions, and priorities. The role of CEMA during the Second World War is both an example of this alignment but also shows how the arts and cultural policies are affected by the State. A broad example of this is the taking of traditional British art and drama into war-torn areas of Britain and poorer, less serviced areas during the War. This both served as a "refreshment" and tonic from the conflict and kept support (both financially and within the public) for the arts alive during the global conflict. For the State, CEMA served as popular propaganda program that focused on promoting positive views of Britain during a period of national turmoil and unease. The alignment of arts and culture with the mechanisms of the State is further seen in the post-war retooling of CEMA.

Beginning in spring 1945, there were debates on the future of CEMA, and how it fit into a post-war world; or even if it belonged in a post-war Britain. An early discussion on the role of CEMA post-war occurred in April 1945, as an article in *The Stage*. In this article, authors comment that while "those magic sets of initials that were unknown before the war but are now household words", CEMA now faced an uncertain future following VE-Day.[250] It was acknowledged that CEMA had "succeeded the worthy task" of providing a cultural outlet across wartime Britain, and its generous funding had provided much to many; but the main focus was on what types of funding CEMA would receive once Britain was no longer at war, and would likely not need to deploy a wartime cultural service.[251] After the election of Britain's first majority Labour government in 1945, a flurry of legislation built the framework for how post-war Britain would look and function. Among these was legislation and funding that renamed the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts to the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB, referred to in this thesis simply as the Arts Council), creating the Council as the Government's official agency for the support of arts. This was followed shortly after with the Local Government Act of 1948, which gave local governments the ability to collect tax strictly for the support of arts.[252] This new legislation provided the

---

[250] "CEMA", *The Stage*, 26 April 1945.
[251] "CEMA"*, The Stage*, 26 April 1945.
[252] Arthur Marwick, British *Society Since 1945*. (London: Penguin Books, 2003). 38. In addition, it is noted in the First Annual Review of the Arts Council that "The policy of the Arts Council is still that of CEMA". See: "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1945-1946." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1946, 10.

funding necessary for the Arts Council to continue developing and supporting arts programs across Britain. As discussed by Arthur Marwick, where CEMA had succeeded in bringing high forms of culture into parts of the country where it had previously been inaccessible, the renamed Arts Council fitted into the Labour Government's commitment to the Welfare State by not only providing health and housing provisions, but also provisions for intellectual and imaginative aspects of life.[253] Marwick also points out that prior to the Second World War, the most accessible form of culture had been novels; and the CEMA/ Arts Council had been, and would be used, to integrate culture into society.[254] This included galleries and museums, along with travelling exhibitions (such as those associated with 1951's Festival of Britain) and cultural festivals, furthering the mission to make the arts more accessible.

The transition and reformation of CEMA into the Arts Council as a government-funded body supporting the interests of the arts provides evidence of the post-war approach to British cultural policy, which reflected an understanding of the power of using culture. We can also see the aligning of cultural polices with government policy, and how one was affected by the other also in the post-war roles of the Arts Council, which would later have separate entities overseeing Scotland and Wales's culture and heritage. It is also found in both Labour and Conservative government's embrace and financial support for cultural festivities and exhibitions that reflected the government's views on the future and their related policies. In later chapters, we will see this in government support for the Festival of Britain, the Commonwealth Arts Festival, and the Fanfare for Europe; but it is still important to discuss the growth of the Arts Council, and the similarities shared with programs and initiatives that were being produced by the Arts Council. This is because at times, some of the Arts Council's activities shared similarities with government cultural polices that had been shaped around concepts of presenting Britain as new and modern, an example of which could be to explain why Britons should be enthusiastic about things like the Commonwealth and Europe. A brief overview on government funding of the arts, including both Conservative and Labour governments, follows.

4.2: Government and the Arts: A brief overview of Government Support for the Arts

This section serves as a brief overview on the role of government support for the arts, not just in Treasury funding of CEMA and the Arts Council, as discussed earlier. While it is

---

[253] Marwick, *British Society Since 1945*, 53.
[254] Marwick, *British Society Since 1945*, 53

nowhere near a complete analysis, this section will further provide evidence on the growing relationship between the arts and successive British governments, of both parties, to show how, during the 1950s, 60s, and 70s, there were periods when cultural policies seemed to align with governmental policies and priorities, and how government priorities could be seen to affect the role of the arts and cultural policies and their interactions with society. This relationship can be reflected in funding. While some of Britain's great museums and galleries—like The British Museum, Victoria and Albert Museum, and National Gallery—were established in the eighteenth and nineteenth Centuries; art collecting, appreciation, and exhibition was largely the preserve of the wealthy few and away from the public gaze. Despite the establishment of the aforementioned public museums, the British government had consistently opposed spending public money on the arts throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries believing that, like the economy, the arts were best left to the free market.[255] As noted earlier, the 1891 Museums and Gymnasiums Act and the Public Libraries Act in 1892 established free museums, yet much of Britain's cultural heritage remained in private collections across the country in great estates and manors.

In post-war Britain, National Trust properties were just beginning to open for the first time, revealing their great collections of art and heritage. Discussions around further government support for museums and art galleries began shortly after the redevelopment of CEMA into the Arts Council, when it was argued that private patronage alone did not provide enough support for Britain's museums. Previously, funding from the Treasury had assisted in the cultivation and accessibility of culture, as seen in CEMA's programs during the Second World War but failed to provide funds to museums to assist with running costs, staffing, and maintenance of buildings and collections; as well as funding exhibitions and procuring new objects. An early government-produced document discussed how these shortcomings were negatively affecting Britain's cultural integrity, loosely echoing the important role CEMA played in preserving and promoting British culture during wartime. 1959's Conservative government under Macmillan's premiership produced the pamphlet "Patronage and the Arts", which directly discussed the role of government in preservation and arts, specifically in museums and art galleries. In this pamphlet, the authors condemned both current and past governments for failing to give the heritage industry the support it needed, stating:

---

[255] Huw David Jones, "'An Art of Our Own': State Patronage of the Visual Arts in Wales, 1945–1967," *Contemporary British History* 27, no. 1 (2013): pp. 44-64, https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2012.685690, 44.

"The collections of masterpieces of past artistic achievements in museums and galleries has been accepted for well over a century as a proper field for public authorities….it is all the more strange, therefore, that for the past thirty years government after government has failed to give our museums and galleries the attention they need. The national collections have been unable to develop and expand as they should."[256]

As understood by the quote, the pamphlet demonstrated a consciousness that Britain's arts were failing to develop and that there was an understanding that it was necessary to enrich Britain's cultural contributions to society. Unsurprisingly, as with most things, the role of government in the arts would be politicized. Following on from "Patronage and the Arts", Labour produced "Leisure for Living" in 1959, which also discussed museums and galleries.

Labour argued that public support for the arts "ought not to be an issue of party politics"—Labour remarking that only their party has long supported public art initiatives, and that Conservative governments have dragged their feet when making any real change to support public art programs, instead wanting the enjoyment of art to remain a privilege of the elite and wealthy.[257] This leads to the interpretation that Conservative approaches to the arts could be found in supporting the preservation of masterpieces, whereas Labour hoped to democratize culture and believed that significant artworks should be made available to the general public. It was the view that "high culture"—such as classic masterpieces and sculpture—should "not be the exclusive preserve of a particular social class or of a metropolitan area", and that national treasures "should be accessible without regard to the impediments of class circumstances."[258] However, as both Conservative and Labour ministers soon realized and acknowledged the important role of the arts, the lack of government

---

[256] Richard Carless, Patricia Brewster, "Patronage and the Arts", London 1959, 15. Labour Party Archives.

[257] "Leisure for Living", The Labour Party, October 1959, 12.

[258] Mulcahy, "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches", 323. An obvious example of Labour's support for the arts would be the Festival of Britain in 1951; which was heavily criticized by the Conservative opposition for being a waste of public funds, and was quickly deconstructed and sold for scrap upon Churchill's return to Downing Street in October 1951. Another example would be 1962's Festival of Labour, which, along with the Festival of Britain, is discussed in depth in the next chapter. Like the Festival of Britain, the Festival of Labour focused on the arts and the role of the artist in society. The Festival of Labour compared Britain's use of the artist to her more modern European counterparts, arguing that only with proper patronage of the arts, could Britain achieve the cultural status that Labour felt was being enjoyed in Europe—having a culture that was shared and accessible to all, not just the elite few. This provides further evidence on political parties realizing the importance of the arts in facilitating government agendas, and comparisons to the role of CEMA in promoting, maintaining, and providing accessibility to the arts can be seen.

support for the arts and lack of funding was addressed, creating a wider discussion on the involvement of the government in the arts and heritage.

In response to calls for government to be more involved with funding for the arts, in 1961, the Conservative Political Centre published "Government and the Arts", which discussed the costs of making the arts and culture more accessible and how this fitted into Conservative policies. In this report, the authors (a selection of MPs) commented that "Cultural activities are now open to all, and the corollary is that all must help to pay for them. This poses two great problems: first, how far should the arts be subsidized with taxpayers' or ratepayers' money; and second, what is the best machinery for this purpose?"[259] "Government and the Arts" attempted to provide examples of how the government was already supporting the arts, explaining that government spending on the arts was demonstrated by The British Museum Bill, The National Theatre Scheme as part of an Arts Centre for the South Bank, and the upcoming Shakespeare Festival of 1964 and the first (and only, as we know now) Commonwealth Festival of the Arts in 1965. The report felt that these examples provided proof of the government's commitment to funding the arts more efficiently, however the report failed to provide an understanding that, at the time of publication, there was more that was required of the government. To further this notion, "Government and the Arts" explained its involvement with The British Council and its role in supporting the arts at a State level, explaining that the British Council's main, and most important, role was focused on developing closer cultural relations between Britain and other countries, the aim of which was to promote a wider knowledge of Britain and the English language overseas.[260] This suggests the view held by the Government, which was that government's role within the arts was better served when supporting Britain's interests abroad, and given the context of this publication—during a period of rapid decolonization, the Cold War, and the growth of the European Community—this is understandable, but the report fails to acknowledge that the arts within Britain needed more State intervention, especially with funding.

---

[259] "Government and the Arts", Conservative Political Centre, 1961. Labour Party Archives, 9. This report was written by Sir Hamilton Keer, BT, MP; Sir Hugh Lucas-Tooth, BT MP; Sir Richard Nugent, BT, MP; Hon. Nicholas Ridley, AMICE, MP.

[260] The pamphlet explains that The British Council was granted a Royal Charter in 1940 and was mainly financed by Parliamentary grants (Treasury funding of the wartime CEMA was not mentioned). "Government and the Arts", 9.

The Wilson Government and their support for the arts provides insight into how the workings of the State and the arts became more intertwined, with the arts often reflecting the government's priorities and views. The appointment of Jennie Lee to the newly created Ministry of Arts in 1964 and the government's 1965 White Paper, *A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps* demonstrated both an understanding of, and support for, the remarkable change in support for the arts in Britain that was happening.[261] Within the White Paper, we can see the vision of Lee within the Wilson administration for making the arts more accessible throughout Britain. Lee wrote that "In any civilized community the arts and associated amenities, serious or comic, light or demanding, must occupy a central place. Their enjoyment should not be regarded as remote from everyday life."[262] Lee stated that the support for enacting this could be found in three categories: education, preservation, and patronage. Education would cover the arts within schools, colleges, and universities, as well as libraries, and would fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education and Science. Regrading preservation, museums and galleries would be largely financed by the Treasury, and historic buildings and monuments would be financed and overeen by the Ministry of Public Building and Works. Patronage, Lee wrote, would be given by the State towards poetry, sculpture, painting, drama, and music, and would be channeled through the Arts Council and the Scottish and Welsh Committees.[263]

Many of the proposals listed by Lee in *A Policy for the Arts* were demonstrated during Lee's tenure as Minister for the Arts. Of the more obvious, government aid more than doubled, and outreach went further than previous organizations had (Lee would later state in an interview in the 1980s that funding for the arts under Labour trebled).[264] A notable change in funding can be explained in the transfer of grant sources for the Arts Council from the Treasury to the Department of Education and Science; a policy move that coincided with Lee taking responsibility for museums and public galleries, which had previously been under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works. This drastic change in cultural planning allowed for the new arrangement within the Ministry of Arts to act as a singular home for the arts; which would in turn allow for a more cohesive and better management of

---

[261] Green, *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*, 10-11.

[262] Department of Education and Science. A Policy for the Arts: The First Steps. London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, February 1965, paragraph 14.

[263] A Policy for the Arts, 16-19.

[264] "Exhibition: The Jennie Lee Archive Collection," Exhibition: The Jennie Lee Archive Collection: Minister for the Arts - Open University Digital Archive, accessed December 15, 2021, https://www.open.ac.uk/library/digital-archive/exhibition/177/theme/6/page/1.

grants and funding.[265] In 1967, to further reflect the aspirations of Lee and her dedication to making the arts more accessible, the aims of the Arts Council were revised. Their three main points of interest reflect the growing integration of the arts and politics, and were:

> "to develop and improve the knowledge, understanding and practice of the arts; To increase the accessibility of the arts to the public throughout Great Britain; To advise and cooperate with Departments of government, local authorities and other bodies on matters concerned whether directly or indirectly with the foregoing objects."[266]

Aside from this, Lee also oversaw a reimagining of the role of the arts in schools and universities. While this endeavor does not entirely apply to the research questions and theme of this thesis, it is worth a small discussion as many of the initiatives around the arts and education can be found in the activities pursued by the Welsh Committee in the 1960s, as discussed in the next section of this chapter, and further shows the planned integration of the arts into society. Lee remarked in her White Paper that all of the artistic activities and programs that were supported by the Arts Council (and Welsh and Scottish Committee), such as developments in housing the arts, program attendance and engagement with the arts and music, would fail to deliver or gain traction if there was not an increased influence of the arts in education. She comments that "if children at an early age become accustomed to the idea of the arts as a part of everyday life, then they are more likely in maturity first to appreciate them and then to demand them", meaning that only if the arts and integrated more into schooling will adults have a greater appreciation, understanding, and expectation for a culturally-enriched nation.[267] She remarks that "the place that the arts occupy in the life of a nation is largely a reflection of the time and effort devoted to them" and that only by providing better funding to schools, facilities, and financial resources can the role of the arts be fully integrated into all aspects of society. [268]

But perhaps the largest aspect of government involvement with the arts can be seen when looking at funding for the arts, where we can see a seemingly steady increase in financial support for the arts by both Conservative and Labour governments. The Arts Council was the largest source of funding and influence in the arts during this period, and when looking at their funding data from the 1950s-1970s, we see an increase in government

---

[265] Green, *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*, 12-13.
[266] Green, *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*, 9-10.
[267] A Policy for the Arts, 58.
[268] A Policy for the Arts, 58.

support of the arts and funding. The Arts Council received grant-in-aid (GIA) funding from the government, which was then allocated regionally to promote the arts; it is worth noting that this is the same model that is used today.[269] Funding for the arts steadily expanded during this period, but it was most notable during the mid-Sixties under Wilson's Labour government. The increase in financial support for the government can be seen when looking at the chairpersons of the Arts Council (from 1945 to its reorganization in 1994), where we can see how both the chairman contributed to the growing role of the Arts Council and funding, but also a further integration of culture and politics.[270] This is demonstrated in the table below, and a discussion on how politics affected the Arts Council will follow.

Chairman	Tenure	Annual funding (at end of tenure)
1. John Maynard Keynes	1946	£235,000
2. Sir Ernest Pooley	1946-1953	£400,000
3. Sir Kenneth Clark	1953-1960	£1,500,000
4. The 4th Baron Cottesloe	1960-1965	£3,205,000
5. Baron Goodman	1965-1972	£11,900,000
6. Patrick Gibson	1972-1977	£28,850,000
7. Sir Kenneth Robinson	1977-1982	£80,450,000
8. Sir William Rees-Mogg	1982-1989	£154,064,000
9. Peter Palumbo	1989-1994	£186,000,000

[269] N. Dempsey, (2016) *Arts Funding: Statistics*. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper no. CBP 7655. London: House of Commons Library. [Online] [Accessed on November 11 2020]. file:///C:/Users/174501/Downloads/CBP-7655%20(1).pdf, page 16. This document has a complete breakdown of arts funding using the grant-in-aid programme from 1955 to 1994, and also includes price comparisons adjusted with inflation to today. Funding for Wales, Scotland, and England are shown. Looking at England only, the GIA income in 1955/56 was an extremely small amount, £710, with an even smaller expenditure of £610. This increased drastically to an GIA income in 1975/76 of £23,347; with an expenditure of £23,338.
[270] The table was compiled using Annual Reports from the Arts Council, all of which have been digitized and uploaded to the Art Council's website. For more, see the Chairman's Report and Annual Accounts in the Annual Reports for the years: 1945-1946, 1951-1952, 1959-1960, 1964-1965, 1971-1972, 1975-1976, 1981-1982, 1988-1989, 1994-1995.

The first chairman of the Arts Council was economist John Maynard Keynes, who had previously been involved in CEMA and was one of the founding members of the Arts Council. The wartime policies relating to the arts would transition into peacetime, with Keynes announcing in 1945, shortly after the announcement that the Arts Council had received its Royal Charter and had secured its future, that the "policy of the Arts Council is still that of CEMA", and in large part due to Keynes' immense interest in the arts, he hoped the Arts Council would continue to "encourage the best of British national arts, everywhere, and to do it as far as possible by supporting others".[271] It was hoped that through the support of the Arts Council, many forms of art would flourish across Britain, and that "different parts of the country would again walk their several ways as they once did and learn to develop something different from their neighbors and characteristic of themselves".[272] There was an awareness that culture needed to be encouraged to develop and reflect its local surroundings, and that London (and other major metropolitan cities) could not remain the only centers of artistic influence. One of the avenues taken to cultivate this was the use of local arts clubs, which featured regularly in the annual reports of the 1940s and early 1950s.

Upon Lord Keynes' death, the Chancellor of the Exchequer appointed Sir Ernest Pooley as the next chairman, which he held until his retirement in 1952/53. One of the first major political influences in the activities of the Arts Council was 1951's Festival of Britain. It was announced in the 1947-1948 Annual Report that the Arts Council was tasked with organizing the arts programs for the Festival, and that resources and financial assistance could be limited or redirected from other activities to support this.[273] Pooley discusses in the 1950-1951 Annual Report that, due to this assignment, the government had allocated additional funds—approximately £400,000—to the Arts Council for use with planning and supporting the government's Festival of Britain. It was noted that this increase in funding was only to cover this planning period, and Pooley was quick to note that there should not be any false hope that these levels of government support and rapid increases in funding would continue, unless deemed beneficial to the government; but that this event had raised the profile of the Arts Council and its activities significantly.[274] Pooley's tenure can be seen as

---

[271] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1945-1946." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1946, 10.

[272] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1945-1946." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1946, 6.

[273] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1947-1948." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1948, 6-7.

[274] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1950-1951." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1951, 4-10.

being dominated by the Festival of Britain, and many of the political influences on the Arts Council during this period related to the Festival, and its planning and implementation.

Pooley's replacement in 1953 was Sir Kenneth Clark, who had also been a founding member of CEMA. Clark discussed in his first annual report the need for greater funding from the Treasury, noting that while the Arts Council was able to maintain its commitments, it was only at a subsistence level and that it could not take on any new endeavors, or provide support for organizations that desperately needed their assistance.[275] Clark discusses that despite economic difficulties, many of the organizations that receive support from the Arts Council are successful and creating profits and as a result (and perhaps due to limited funding and additional government assistance), the Arts Council has to reduce subsidies to successful organizations, which many felt was "penalizing success".[276] The lack of government support for the arts is demonstrated by headlines such as "Art in the Red" (1956-1957 Annual Report) and "The Struggle for Survival" (1958-1959 Annual Report), and while many of the annual reports from the Clark era report steady increases in funding from the Treasury, often it is suggested that this merely is in-line with inflation, and are not substantive increases in government support for the arts. Political influence on the role of the Arts Council in this period seems to be minimal or non-existent, with the Eden and Macmillan conservative governments not fully supporting the arts apart from seemingly obligatory resources from the Treasury. This period shows that much of the distribution of funding received by the Arts Council goes towards Local Authorities, to distribute at their discretion, or towards major projects, such as funding for national operas, Sadler's Wells, etc. The role of government's having a substantive influence in the arts returns in the 1960s.

Sir Kenneth was replaced as chairman in 1960 with the 4th Baron Cottesloe, who had previously been the Chairman of the Tate Gallery Trustees. Cottesloe's 1961-1962 Annual Report, entitled "A Brighter Prospect" reflected the optimism of the Arts Council, an encouraging departure from the headlines of the Clark era. This was due to a substantial increase in funding—above inflation—that had not fully been realized since the Arts Council was involved with the Festival of Britain, which Cottesloe attributes to the Conservative MP

---

[275] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1953-1954." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1954, 13.
[276] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1954-1955." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1955, 18-19.

Selwyn Lloyd, who had been appointed as the new Chancellor.[277] More funds were directed towards major institutions, such as Covent Garden, Local Authorities, and struggling organizations in an attempt to balance out years of minimal funding. When Cottesloe retired in 1964, it was felt as a significant loss to the Arts Council, and it was noted that his excellent leadership had been during a period in which "developments took place which amount to a revolution in its history".[278] His tenure oversaw some of the largest amounts of funding being directed towards housing the arts, cultivating new troupes and organizations, and revolutions "in the cultural life of the provinces".[279] The "revolutions" could be identified in the support being given to the Welsh and Scottish Arts Councils to better fund and support their own internal endeavors, which helped shift cultural activities from the sole persevere of London or other major metropolitan areas.[280] Due to engagement from the Chancellor, Cottesloe was able to secure more funding than before, with Local Authorities and councils being able to better support and cultivate local art exhibitions, venues, and programs.

One of the longer tenures held was by Baron Goodman. Goodman recognized early that there was an increased appetite, especially amongst students and younger generations, for more exhibitions, lectures, and festivals of the arts, and that it was this age group that was driving much of the interests and participation in the arts.[281] Goodman also acknowledged the chronic underfunding of the Welsh and Scottish Committees, and noted that there was an apparent snobbery (perhaps supported by the lack of funding) for the Arts Council in these regions, and that, in Scotland especially, there has had to be tough choices made about the types of endeavors that are supported. Goodman noted that Scotland was in her own capacity to make these decisions without outside influence, but that increases in grants towards Scotland (and Wales) were a priority (he noted that in 1966-1967, Scotland received an 80% increase in funding, to a total of £450,000).[282] Following the appointment of Jennie Lee as the first minister for the arts and her 1965 *A Policy on the Arts* White Paper, the political

[277] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1961-1962." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1962, 3. Cottesloe notes that Lloyd supported/held interest in the arts and implies that this is part of the rationale behind the large increase in funding from the Treasury.
[278] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1964-1965." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965, 6,52.
[279] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1964-1965." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965, 6,52.
[280] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1964-1965." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965, 6,52.
[281] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1965-1966." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1966, 10.
[282] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1965-1966." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1966, 39.

involvement with the Arts Council further increased. As Goodman noted in 1967, Lee's direct involvement provided additional resources given by a "Government anxious to stimulate and develop the work we do".[283] This not only included increased resources for arts education, as noted above.[284] Goodman also oversaw a greater distribution of assets and resources to regions outside of London, to greater cultivate artistic and cultural centers across England, Wales, and Scotland. It was noted that a "distinct shift in the allocation of resources between London and the rest of the United Kingdom" had occurred over recent years and that activities outside of London had claimed "a greater share" of resources.[285] With his close working relationship with Jennie Lee, Goodman's tenure resulted in a golden era for the Arts Council. During this period annual funding increased from £3,205,000 in 1965 to £11,900,000 in 1972, generally in increases that were above inflation.[286]

Much of Patrick Gibson's tenure was faced with financial hardships, often attributed to the inflation and the economic problems that plagued the early 1970s, with many of the Annual Reports from his tenure discussing "value for money" or "the arts in hard times". An example of this can be found in the 1973-1974 Annual Report, where Gibson noted that the Arts Council had received an increase of 14.3% in funding from the previous year, but that inflation over the past financial year had been 17%, so in all reality, the Arts Council had received a decrease in funds.[287] It was noted that during this period, the arts in Wales and Scotland faced their biggest crisis since wartime, and there were concerns about how to continue in the face of economic concerns.[288] While funding for the Arts Council increased to almost £29 million by the end of Gibson's chairmanship in 1977; it was noted that many of the arts organizations and facilities were in deficit and failing to create profits; which again was attributed to the difficult economic times. Year on year, funding increases were less than inflation rates. In his final year as chairman, Gibson credited Labour MP and Arts Minister Hugh Jenkins for ensuring the Arts Council received its share of the national budget during "acute economic difficulties".[289] And while Gibson acknowledged that Jenkins was an "old

---

[283] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1966-1967." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1967, 9-10.

[284] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1967-1968." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1968, 9.

[285] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972, 9.

[286] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972, 10.

[287] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1973-1974." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1974, 9.

[288] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1973-1974." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1974, 35.

[289] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1975-1976." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976, 7.

friend" of the Arts Council and was artistically minded, due to economic pressures and governmental endeavors to cut spending, Labour in the 1970s did not reflect its previous administrations and support the arts as deeply as before. The impression given by Gibson is that, despite Jenkin's pleas in Parliament for more support from the Treasury for the Arts Council, they fell on deaf ears with blame regularly being placed on economic circumstances. Hugh Jenkins draws upon this in his autobiographical text *The Culture Gap: An Experience of the Government and the Arts* (1979), where Jenkins explains analytically how the government functions within the arts. In *The Culture Gap*, it is evident that Jenkins feels that the arts are best served when its government minister and representative have a passion, care, and understanding and appreciation for the arts.

The tenure of Sir William Rees-Mogg was met with the reality that funding, while at times being adjusted to meet inflation, would not rise substantially and that the Arts Council would need to make better use of their "limited" resources and fostering financial sponsorship from outside the Arts Council was encouraged.[290] Under Rees-Mogg, a more business-like approach was taken to the arts and many of the annual reports from his chairmanship stress the importance and growing dependence on business sponsorship and investment. However, there was direct government intervention in the Arts Council during 1982-1983, when the government provided a one-off payment of £5 million to settle any past deficits.[291] Scotland faced challenges with rising costs and endeavors to take the arts to more remote areas of the nation but focused on directing funds towards cultivating and supporting traditional and folk arts, as well as amateur art activities. The Scottish Arts Council was noted as working closely with local authorities and organizations to provide services, especially in rural areas; the same challenges and responses were found in Wales.[292] Lack of increases in funding or support for the Scottish and Welsh Arts Councils was a reoccurring theme during the 1980s, and as mentioned earlier, they shifted their focus on corporate sponsorship to survive.

The final chairman of the Arts Council before its reorganization in 1994 was Peter Palumbo. Despite the appearance of funding increases under Rees-Mogg and Palumbo, when adjusted for inflation, the Arts Council's funding was consistently less than the previous

---

[290] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1981-1982." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1982, 5.
[291] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1982-1983." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1983, 6.
[292] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1982-1983." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1983, 16-17.

periods.[293] Because of this, Palumbo wrote in the 1992-1993 Annual Report that it was "more necessary than ever that the Arts Council be fiercely independent from, but responsible to, Government."[294] This was due to a perceived lack of understanding or importance within government and the Treasury to the needs or the importance of the arts.[295] Perhaps due to this, Palumbo positively viewed entry into the single market in 1992 as providing "untold opportunities for the cross-fertilization of the arts", which he felt Europe would benefit from, and that the influence of British arts and artists on the Community would be unmatched.[296] The impression that the British Government did not appreciate the arts as fully as her European counterparts was felt, and the decision taken to divide the Arts Council into three separate funding bodies and organizations (Wales, England, and Scotland all operating wholly independently) was supported.

While this is far from a comprehensive look into government funding for the arts during the decades following the Second World War, it does provide a basic understanding of the types of funding that museums and galleries were receiving, which in turn resulted in the increased amount of art exhibitions during this period. This simple data provides us with the evidence to claim that there were periods in which government commitments to supporting the arts and funding grew, regardless of whether it was a Labour or Conservative government occupying Downing Street. In these basic statistics, we can argue that the notion of Britain being behind her European counterparts in terms of artistic support, as mentioned earlier in "Patronage of the Arts", was being rectified. When looking at periods when there were increases in funding for the arts from the Treasury that outpaced inflation, we can not only understand the growing influence of politics when it comes to the types of exhibitions that were being curated; but also see direct evidence of the arts being utilized as government agencies. This was evidenced earlier by the use of the Arts Council as an official entity aimed at supporting the government via the arts, with the most notable early example of this being Arts Council support for the Festival of Britain. It also shows the gradual understanding by both Conservative and Labour governments of the societal benefits of a well-funded arts program and that the arts should be supported by taxpayers. It is important to note, however, that there were periods when governments provided more support, which increased activities

---

[293] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1994-1995." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1995, 4. Palumbo commented that despite grants and funding, he estimated a loss of 12% in cuts over 1992-1995.
[294] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1992-1993." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1993, 2.
[295] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1992-1993." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1993, 2.
[296] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1988-1989." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1989, 1, 52.

and support for smaller and regional organizations, and there were periods when governments were perceived to provide a minimal level of support from the Treasury. Despite the appearance of steady increases in financial support, there were periods when inflation moved at a rate higher and faster than Treasury funds.

Until the division of the Arts Council in the 1990s, heritage was largely focused in England, yet Wales and Scotland received ample funding and relative autonomy in their decision making and interests. As a result of this in the 1960s Wales and Scotland began to advocate for further autonomy to support their interests which, in some instances, included questions around (and including the use of) heritage. From these discussions and gradual autonomy, developments in the commodification of heritage and traditional cultures at times translated into a desire to join the growing European Community.

4.3: Wales and Scotland: Arts, Heritage, Government.

An entire thesis could be dedicated to nationalist movements within Wales and Scotland, but for the purposes of this thesis, the influence of Welsh and Scottish heritage while Britain was making her political turn towards Europe is worth a brief discussion; especially when looking at concepts of modernity and newness. The end of the Second World War marked a new dawn for the arts in Britain, with the organizations previously discussed supporting the cultivation and maintenance of the arts. Despite the post-war reality of austerity; new theatre, dance, and music companies were founded, resulting in the number of professional artists and musicians increasing, which in turn continued the role of CEMA in allowing the public more opportunities to see plays, concerts, and exhibitions.[297] The formal establishment of the Arts Council in 1946 was a landmark in British cultural policy, and while Scotland and Wales would not receive their own independent art bodies until much later, the Art Council's decision in the late 1940s to create two separate Welsh and Scottish Committees for the arts is a rare example of cultural devolution prior to the 1960s.[298] From this, we see clear evidence that suggests that while the Arts Council continued CEMA's policies of making the arts more accessible, national heritages also gained a platform to promote themselves, their own identity, and their own interests that was both separate from a British national identity but also part of the building blocks in creating the new, post-war modern Britain.

---

[297] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 44.
[298] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 46.

In this section, the role of the Welsh and Scottish Committees in cultural policy will be discussed; exploring how these two committees promoted, maintained, and developed their own programs, separate from England and Parliament's broader political interests.

Wales

The spirit of cultural policies that would shape the arts of the post-war era was optimistically proclaimed in a pamphlet produced for the Arts Council. "Partners in Patronage" expressed: "an encouraging feature of the effort to sustain the arts in Britain is to the extent to which municipalities, large and small, are now participating in that task. What has long been a common practice in many European countries is at last being adopted…"[299] It was suggested that the arts, long neglected until the advent of CEMA, would begin to undergo a cultural refashioning, bringing the arts into the modernizing, post-war world.

In Wales, prior to the Second World War, Welsh art galleries rarely showed exhibitions of contemporary Welsh artists, instead following patterns set by London galleries on showcasing classical paintings and European artworks. Following the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain in 1946, the devolution of the arts allowed for greater freedom to promote Welsh interests and heritage under the guidance of the Welsh Committee. Beginning in 1947, both the Scottish and Welsh Committees, in their capacity as semi-independent branches of the Arts Council, received grants and funding from the Arts Council main funding body to use at their own discretion.[300] It was also noted in "Partners in Patronage" that, largely in a response from the wartime activities of CEMA, there was an increasing interest in the arts among many industrial workers and communities, which Wales (and Scotland) could certainty be classified under.[301] By examining various annual reports during the 1950s and 1960s, we see the Welsh Committees attempts to use their funding to develop their arts programs to showcase Welsh culture and its unique contribution to Britain throughout their exhibitions. During the period of 1957-1967, the funds received from the Arts Council rose from £35,000 in 1957 to £430,000 in 1967.[302] The results of this substantial increase in funding can be seen in various aspects when looking at the activities of the Welsh

---

[299] TNA BD 24/95: Miscellaneous Welsh Bodies: Arts Council in Wales; "Partners in Patronage", undated.
[300] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1946-1947." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1947, 3.
[301] TNA BD 24/95: Miscellaneous Welsh Bodies: Arts Council in Wales; "Partners in Patronage", undated.
[302] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1967-1968." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1968, 45.

Committee during this period, including exhibitions, venue spaces, and events; all of which will be discussed in this section.

Surveys into cultural policies and the arts in Wales revealed that the visual arts in Wales was one of the least developed areas, with the Welsh Committee reflecting "Almost all correspondents [in this survey] stress the need for art galleries, both public galleries provided by the local authorities, schools, institutions and trusts, and private galleries through which artists could market their work."[303] During the 1950s and 1960s, the Welsh Committee's main areas of focus centered around cultivating and expanding interest in the visual arts. While the Committee spent more of their funds on drama and music, the visual arts received the most direct attention. The decision to prioritize the visual arts stemmed from the widely held belief that Wales had no visual tradition of its own; a myth that needed debunking.[304]According to Huw Jones in "An Art of Our Own",

> "The standard explanation for Wales' lack of a visual tradition was the belief that the Welsh…were a spiritual people whose [artistic] talents lay in oral traditions like music and poetry, rather than the making or the appreciation of material objects like paintings and sculptures."[305]

An example of this traditional focus on the oral traditions within Wales can be found in one of her oldest cultural festivals: Eisteddfod. Distinctively more Celtic and infused with traditional folklore than her English neighbor, some of the oldest celebrations on Wales' artistic identity dates back to 1176 with the founding of the Eisteddfod: a festival focusing on Welsh culture. This included language, music, and the arts; and while the current organization of the National Eisteddfod dates to the Nineteenth Century, the visual arts is not one of the main features of the celebrations. [306]

---

[303] TNA, BD 23/156: Panel for Cultural Affairs, The Arts in Wales, 1964-1966. This document, "summary on the visual arts in Wales", is undated.

[304] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 48.

[305] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 48.

[306] "About Us." National Eisteddfod -. Accessed August 17, 2021. https://eisteddfod.wales/about-us. Another interesting component to a revival of traditional Welsh language and literature relates to scholar and poet Iolo Morganwg (born Edward Williams, 1747-1826). During his lifetime, Morganwg was a well-known Romantic poet, being one of the central movers in the Welsh cultural revival. His establishment of the Gorsedd of the Bards in 1792, which he (falsely) claimed as an ancient guardian Wales' culture and language, soon became linked to the Eisteddfod. Modern scholars recognize that many of the works written or translated by Morganwg were of his own creation, or at least heavily embellished by him, but during his lifetime, his works resonated deeply with the Welsh and lead to a cultural revival and embraces of Wales' cultural traditions. His Gorsedd became an institution known for cherishing and protecting the Welsh language and literature and reflected Morganwg's passion for Welsh history, especially from the era of Wales' princes. For more, see:

One of the first art exhibitions from the Welsh Committee was *Masterpieces from Welsh Houses*, on display during 1946-1947, which was noted by the Arts Council as one of the greatest, regional exhibitions hosted that added value to the mission of the ACGB.[307] The notion put forth by Jones, as also revealed by the Welsh Committee's surveys on the arts in Wales, was hoped to be remedied by the decision to show a contemporary Wales through its art exhibitions, hosted in Wales' leading public galleries, including the National Museum of Wales in Cardiff, the Glynn Vivian Art Gallery in Swansea and the Gregynog Gallery at the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth. Shifts in art that promoted contemporary Wales reflected the changes that was happening in Wales both culturally and politically. The character of Welsh industry, long characterized by coal mining and heavy industry, was shifting towards the manufacturing of cars, goods, and other electronics; with mining villages becoming more obsolete and major Welsh cities looking more like their English counterparts. The same, of course, was happening elsewhere in Britain, including major cities like Glasgow, which faced a cultural and economic depression following the closure of their long-established and well-known shipbuilding industry.[308] Under government modernization programs which oversaw the building of new steel plants and motorways, the Welsh Committee understood the importance of cultivating an arts policy that evoked the spirit of the "new" and contemporary, cosmopolitan Wales by encouraging works and exhibitions that were characterized by a greater sense of modernity, progress, and internationalism; rather than more traditional Welsh imagery of mines, rural villages, and hills.[309] Jones remarks that while there was a general consensus that Wales formed part of Britain, there was "little agreement about precisely what Wales itself meant", drawing upon remarks made by Sir Alfred Zimmen in his inaugural lecture at University College Wales, Aberystwyth: "'Wales today is not a unity', but three 'different types and different traditions'—rural 'Welsh Wales', industrial 'American Wales' and upper-class 'English Wales'—each of which were 'moving in different directions'"[310]. This, Jones feels, affected the types of art exhibitions that were being curated in the years following World War Two, and that it was part of a mission to help

---

Mary-Ann Constantine, "Songs and Stones: Iolo Morganwg (1747-1826), Mason and Bard." (2006), and Geraint H. Jeknins, *Bard of Liberty: The Political Radicalism of Iolo Morganwg* (2012).

[307] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1946-1947", 19.

[308] John Brown's Yard at Glasgow built many of the iconic liners we associate with the golden age of transatlantic travel: the Lusitania, Aquitania, Queen Mary, Queen Elizabeth and QE2; with the QE2 being the last major liner to be built in 1969, and the final liner being completed in 1972. "Last Ship Leaves Clyde Yard That Built 'Queens'", *The New York Times*, 6 October 1972.

[309] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 55.

[310] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 52.

redefine a modern version of Wales. Jones comments that as industry and traditional forms of employment had changed within Wales, its art scene was as well.

While many of the exhibitions supported by the Welsh Committee in the 1950s focused on images of everyday life within Wales, in the mid-1950s there was a shift towards supporting contemporary and progressive artworks and exhibitions, with *The Times*, for example, giving praise for 'the authorities of the National Museum on giving South Wales this appealing taste of avant-garde contemporary art."[311] It was also understood within the Welsh Committee that there was a necessity to continue CEMA's policies of taking their programs and events to remote villages and towns within the country that normally would not receive them, to further develop the role of the arts in Wales. This concept was directly noted in meetings within the Welsh Committee in 1961, at the prospect of the closure of a local art gallery. A former art classroom in rural Welshpool had been transformed into an art exhibition space in 1949, and had since hosted numerous loans from the Arts Council, Victoria and Albert Museum, and other clubs and societies in Wales, and had been enjoyed by a considerable number of people.[312] It was noted to the Committee that this space had played an important role in the artistic life in Wales, and that every year between 1952-1961, there had been at least one art exhibition that focused on contemporary Welsh artwork; the closure of this art gallery would have removed any art scene from this village.[313] The Welsh Committee assisted with maintaining the local art gallery, but this example highlights another aspect of the role of the Welsh Committee in the arts in Wales: creating the spaces needed to promote and sustain an arts presence.

This direction would take the Welsh Arts Council well into the 1960s, where exhibitions of art and sculpture would present a new progressive cultural policy. A major exhibition that was meant to showcase Wales' new progressive future was the Welsh Committee exhibition *Structure* in June 1966. The exhibition was billed as "the first exhibition exclusively for sculpture and construction" and was organized by the Welsh Committee's radical new Art Director, Peter Jones, in conjunction with the National Museum of Wales and Cardiff Castle.[314] The exhibition featured over 80 pieces that represented the latest trends in British sculpture, and was disbursed across the National Museum of Wales,

[311] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 54.
[312] TNA BD 24/95: "Welshpool Exhibition Room, July 18, 1961"
[313] TNA BD 24/95: "Welshpool Exhibition Room, July 18, 1961"
[314] Gwyn Jones, "Structure 1966 Catalogue". (Cardiff: Welsh Arts Council, National Museum of Wales, 1966).

Cardiff, and within the grounds of Cardiff Castle; and was opened by the Minister of Arts, Jennie Lee.[315] Later, *Sculpture* toured Wales and England, travelling to Swansea, Glynn Vivian Art Gallery, 6-27 August; Bangor, Art Gallery, 3-24 September; London, Arts Council Gallery, 1-22 October.[316] This exhibition was bold and anything but traditional, and demonstrated the Welsh Committee using cultural policy as method for promoting Wales' talents, and to dispel ideas of the nation as being stuck in the past; reflecting a clear understanding in the power of having a strong arts policy. The Welsh Committee's support of contemporary artists and contemporary art exhibitions is only one example of how the Committee used the arts to promote a progressive Wales. Other activities supported by the Welsh Committee outside of the visual arts included publications and venue/exhibition spaces.

The Welsh Committee: Activities outside of the Visual Arts

The exhibitions of contemporary art during the 1960s reflected a growing cultural trend of support for the arts across Wales. It was well discussed and understood within the Welsh Committee that there was a need to develop the arts within Wales, both in terms of venues and exhibitions; but also, in the cultivation of the arts in local and rural areas; continuing one of the founding guidelines of CEMA into the Welsh Committee's actions. One of the methods for making the arts more accessible to more rural areas of Wales was the use of magazines and newspapers. During this period, there were some newspapers and magazines being distributed that were fully devoted to the arts, or had a major emphasis on the arts. Many of them were written in Welsh, such as *Y Genhinen* (translated to *The Leek*), but newspapers like the *Western Mail* and *Daily Post* all regularly contained features on the arts in Wales. *Y Camro* and *Baner ac Amserau Cymru* (*Welsh Flag and Times*) were weekly Welsh Language newspapers that were very much concerned and focused on the arts in Wales, discussing regular drama, radio, TV, music and books; but like the issue revealed by the earlier survey on the arts in Wales, the visual arts and professional arts received little coverage in these publications.[317] While papers and magazines of this nature could also be

---

[315] Jones, "'An Art of Our Own", 57.
[316] Gwyn Jones, "Structure 1966 Catalogue".
[317] TNA BD 23/156: Panel for Cultural Affairs, The Arts in Wales, 1964-1966. "Magazines, Reviews, and Newspapers Concerned with the Arts in Wales".

found in England, their presence suggests there were options available to Welshmen that were unable to access the arts locally.[318]

Outside of these publications, there were also resources being made available for remedying the fact there were few spaces adequate for hosting arts exhibitions and drama in Wales. There were discussions that had been ongoing since the mid-1950s on the necessity to provide more adequate venues to showcase the arts in Wales, including art galleries and music venues. Citing the notion that visitor numbers had been increasing throughout the 1950s to art venues—it was recorded in 1958 that there were 32,466 visitors to art exhibitions arranged by the National Library of Wales—The Welsh Committee understood that the lack of space was a growing concern which needed to be addressed.[319] One of the suggested solutions to remedy this was a proposal to build a new Welsh National Theatre, with plans to invite the famous American architect Frank Lloyd Wright to design the new space, due to his maternal Welsh heritage. This ultimately did not come to fruition due to the Committee's inability to decide where to build the venue, with debates between Swansea and Cardiff and whether which city would provide the most accessibility or have the most to gain from the theatre's presence.[320]Along with a lack of suitable venues, the Committee faced organizational problems. This was further demonstrated in 1961. Recognizing that an art gallery was badly needed in Cardiff, it was proposed to have an art gallery incorporated with a new theatre for the BBC Welsh Orchestra, which was planning on enlarging to become a full-scale Welsh national orchestra.[321] But, due to issues within the Welsh Committee (such as internal disputes, organization), this building issue would not be rectified until the 1980s.

The issues within the management of the Welsh Committee was noted by the Arts Council. It was commented that while "the work of the Arts Council in Wales is sound and commands respect" and "there is no doubt that the work [of the Committee] is capable of a good deal of development", it was acknowledged that this "would have to be done gradually" and that "progress [moving forward] would involve the appointment of a more adequate

---

[318] Unfortunately, this document, BD 23/156, does not include circulation or subscription statistics.
[319] TNA BD 24/95
[320] TNA BD 24/95: "Towards a Welsh National Theatre", Jon Davies, August 4, 1956. A comment from this article also questions the community need for the new theatre, commenting as English theatre is 400 years older than Welsh theatre, perhaps "it hasn't yet earned the respect of the Welshman".
[321] TNA BD 24/95: Committee minutes, July 28, 1961.

director."[322] It was however noted that "although the Welsh Committee might have its personnel improved, it does already represent many of the best people in this field in Wales", suggesting that despite its faults, the Committee was successful in bringing more awareness and accessibility to the arts community throughout Wales.[323] This was further demonstrated after the appointment of a new director, which resulted in increasing accessibility to the arts across Wales. It was noted that between 1960-1963, the Welsh Committee increased art exhibitions from 40 to 90 per year, increased orchestra concerts from 4 to 50 per year, and of a total grant of £140,000, administrative spending decreased to only £13,000 per year.[324] Despite issues faced within the Committee, the organization was able to successfully cultivate an art scene needed to promote Wales.

Another aspect to the mammoth increase in funding during 1957-1968 was—along with producing modern art exhibitions and annual art festivals—the development of Welsh language literary programs (at times assisting with the resurgence in Welsh language learning and preservation in Wales) and the role of the arts in schools. As seen in correspondences from the Welsh Committee to various schools across Wales, there were inquiries about the types and frequency of school visits to arts, cultural, or historical venues/ exhibitions; all of which was undertaken with the object of extending the cultural knowledge and appreciation of the arts by the children. These included arts council film showings, visits to castles and historic sights and museums; as well as theaters and musical concerts. Some schools arranged visits abroad, to Paris and Italy, for their students for the express purpose of cultural enhancement. With few exceptions, many schools encouraged cultural visits as part of their curriculum, at times receiving support of the Welsh Committee.[325] This engagement between education and the arts reflects policies put forward by Jennie Lee, as found in *A Policy for the Arts*, which demonstrates the growing understanding of the role of culture and the arts within society.

As this section has shown, the policies enacted by CEMA on the accessibility and cultivation of the arts was extended upon throughout the 1950s and 1960s in the form of increased art exhibitions, an increased presence in Welsh music and drama; and increases in

---

[322] TNA BD 24/95: "Notes on the work of the arts council, Blaise Gillie, November 19, 1959". Gillie was the Welsh Secretary for the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and was often involved with the Welsh Committee.

[323] TNA BD 24/95: "Notes on the work of the arts council, Blaise Gillie, November 19, 1959".

[324] TNA BD 24/95: "Notes for Record, VC Davies, secretary, February 4, 1964".

[325] TNA BD 23/162: "Panel for Cultural Affairs: Provision for the Arts in Wales, cultural visits undertaken by various schools".

the spaces needed to hold these events, in an attempt to elevate the profile of the arts within Wales. This was seen in the modern art exhibitions of the 1960s, but also in the want to make the arts more accessible to those outside of major cities; all coming together to present the Welsh people as being artistically enlightened. The activities and programs of the Welsh Arts Council in this period aligned with political policies that aimed to present Britain as new and forward looking. This can also be seen in Scotland during this era, who also used their autonomous position within the Arts Council to communicate new ideas and interpretations of Scottish heritage and her role in the post-war world.

Scotland

As discussed in the activities of the Welsh Committee, the arts in Wales were developed to present Wales as being a culturally distinct and separate member of the UK with her heritage explored, celebrated, and developed to reflect the new, post-war era. The role of the arts in Scotland also shows this determined separation of arts and culture from England, and the cultivation of a unique Scottish cultural identity. In many cases, "Britain" often referred to "England" only, and the actions of the Welsh and Scottish Committees helped to change this viewpoint. In programs set by the Scottish Committee, we are also able to find evidence of Scotland's use of the arts to showcase their heritage and cultural identity, and the role of Scotland in post-war Britain. Similar to Wales, Scotland's emphasis was placed on the visual arts, as well as music. Both nations used their devolved art councils, the first government institutions to become separated from England, to their advantage. For Wales and Scotland, in the decades leading up to European Membership, their localized Arts Councils were vehicles to promote their interests in a wider-context, and the chance to promote their nations as contemporary, vibrant nations; and in the same way Welsh and Scottish regiments had been vital in the war effort, their cultural policies would continue to assert their relevance to post-war Britain as a member of the European Community.

The Scottish Arts Council has a slightly longer history than the Welsh branch, having been established in 1942 as the Scottish Committee for the Council for the Encouragement of Music and Arts, becoming the Scottish Committee of the Arts Council in 1947 alongside the Welsh Committee.[326] The ability for the Scottish Committee to carve their own, unique position within the Arts Council is a direct result of their establishment as a separate entity

---

[326] Huw David Jones and Susan Galloway, "The Scottish Dimension of the British Arts Government: A Historical Perspective", *Cultural Trends* 19, no.1 (2010): 27-40. Accessed September 7, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1080/09548961003695981 ; 27-28.

within CEMA in 1942. The establishment of Scottish Advisory Committee within CEMA was due to criticisms that because the organization was based in London and all decisions were made there, Scotland's own cultural traditions were overlooked and therefore not accurately represented.[327] Because of this, Scotland's artistic autonomy remained when CEMA transitioned into the Arts Council. It was noted during the establishment of the Arts Council post-war that the Scottish Committee should retain their "complete territorial autonomy" over the arts in Scotland, with one of the reasons given as "because Scotland is a nation with its own sense of national consciousness and cultural heritage, decisions about the arts in Scotland should be taken in Scotland".[328] While it is interesting that this same philosophy seemingly did not apply to Wales until 1946, this does explain how Scotland's cultural policies were shaped, and how they often differed from those within England and Wales.

One of the first examples of the Scottish Committee having a noticed impact on the arts and culture can be found in one of the early, post-war Arts Council reports. The Arts Council noted in their 1946/1947 Annual Report that exemplary work had been done by both committees demonstrating the value they add to the Arts Council; with the Scottish Council in particular noted for its work.[329] It was stated that "outstanding proof" had been given on the Welsh and Scottish Committee's "value to the [Arts]Council", with Scotland being noted as having been able to adapt to the new role of an independent administrative and arts body separate from London.[330] At times, Scotland's considerable autonomy from the Arts Council shared some of the same approaches to the arts that Wales was exploring in the 1950s, which included the accessibility of the arts. As Wales in the 1950s had focused on establishing more venues for the arts across the country, Scotland instead continued CEMA's wartime practices and focused on regularly organizing travelling art exhibitions, drama, and musical tours across Scotland, focusing on both rural mainland areas and villages, and also Shetland, Orkney, and the Western Isles.[331] The Scottish Committee was also able to organize and promote cultural festivals and pushed for greater integration of Scottish artists, musicians, and writers. In 1956-1957, some of the events that the committee organized included a *Festival of Scottish Plays* featuring mainly contemporary Scottish authors, the *Plitochry*

---

[327] Jones, "The Scottish Dimension of the British Arts Government", 29.
[328] Jones, "The Scottish Dimension of the British Arts Government", 29.
[329] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1946-1947", 3.
[330] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1946-1947", 4.
[331] Jones, "The Scottish Dimension of the British Arts Government", 30.

Drama Festival which attracted 50,000 visitors (an increase of 10,000 from the year prior), and the New Scottish Travelling Theatre, which held five tours and also saw an increase of 10,000 in viewers.[332] 1956 also marked the 10th Anniversary of the Edinburgh Festival, which was attended by The Queen, Duke of Edinburgh, and Princess Margaret; with most of the events reaching capacity.[333]

While the Scottish Committee did actively encourage, promote, and develop contemporary writers, actors, and artists during the first post-war decades, it is worth noting that the arts in Scotland was at times stagnant and not fully able to evolve. This is for a few reasons; one of which being the economic structure of Scotland. Scotland's main source of economic success had been driven by traditional, heavy industries that by the 1950s and 1960s, were not at the cutting edge of modern industrial developments and therefore could no longer compete within Wilson's era of white heat technology. Furthermore, the lack of diversity in Scotland's economy did not allow for other sectors to take up the slack should one area suffer; resulting in average incomes in Scotland at the start of the 1950s being about 10% lower than the rest of the UK.[334] Because of this, a delay in Scotland's cultural regeneration can be attributed to the many inequalities in Scotland's economy and social wellbeing, when compared to England.[335] Another reason for delays or periods of stagnation was difficulties in securing the funds necessary to fully develop or support the arts in Scotland. As mentioned earlier, under the leadership of Baron Cottesloe, financial support was directed towards Scotland (and Wales) to better fund activities and local organizations, in an attempt to shift cultural activities away from London and towards more regions.[336] Cottesloe's successor, Baron Goodman, also recognized that Scotland was chronically

---

[332] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1956-1957." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1957, 59-60.

[333] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1956-1957.", 63.

[334] For an excellent in-depth look at Scotland during this period, see: Richard Finlay's *Modern Scotland, 1914-2000*, Chapter 6: Reconstruction: 1945-1954. Other materials that discuss the economics and politics of Scotland during this period are: Roger Davidson, *The Sexual State: Sexuality and Scottish Governance, 1950-1980* (2012); Angus Calder, *Revolving Culture: Notes from the Scottish Republic* (1994); Ray Ryan, *Ireland and Scotland: Literature and Culture, State and Nation, 1966-2000* (2002), Part 1: Scotland, Region and Nation, Republicanism and Colonialism; and, P.W Preston, "Cutting Scotland Loose: Soft Nationalism and Independence-in-Europe." *England after the Great Recession*, 2012, 91-105.

[335] While the cultural festivals, travelling drama and musical tours in the 1950s as discussed earlier were successful and popular, due to economic hardships associated with a loss of traditional industry, Scotland's cultural regeneration largely occurred much later, in the 1980s and 1990s.

[336] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1964-1965." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965, 52.

underfunded, which resulted in even more resources being directed towards the Scottish Arts Council in the late 1960s and early 1970s.[337]

In the Arts Council's Annual Report in 1971-1972, the separate role of Scotland is discussed by examining the ways in which the (now renamed) Scottish Arts Council has been able to focus on the priorities of Scotland, which suggests a localized response towards the delay in Scotland's cultural regeneration, and also Scotland's economic hardships and issues. It acknowledges that Government and local government are concerned with essential expenditures (such as housing, infrastructure, education, and the environment), and that arts councils—which act as agents of the Government in distributing funding—must also share these concerns, as well as work towards the development and accessibilities of the arts. This can be found by finding ways to merge the needs of the community along with devoting parts of public expenditure to leisure and the arts. Cultivating a society that appreciates and supports the artist is one of these methods. By supporting and recognizing the achievements and traditions of the past, there is the opportunity to support new endeavors.[338] Some of these discussions reflected sentiments shared within the Welsh Committee, including lack of suitable venues and spaces to showcase and house the arts, and there are examples given of how the organization has devoted time and funding to rectify this, but unlike arts councils in Wales and England, the Scottish Arts Council is directly involved in mounting and touring art exhibitions (as opposed to just securing the funds necessary for organizations and venues to curate their own).[339] What this allowed for was a more managed approach to integrating the arts into society and maximizing public engagement, which the Arts Council felt was a healthy development by the Scottish Arts Council.[340]

Within the 1970s, Scotland experienced a resurgence in its national heritage, both as means to encourage tourism, but also as a way to reorganize—and recognize—Scotland's own national identity and her contributions to post-war Britain. Britain at this time was experiencing a resurgence in craft; but in 1970s Scotland, there was a particular demand for

---

[337] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1965-1966." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1966, 39.

[338] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972, 28.

[339] The annual report notes that during the 1971-1972 year, the Scottish Arts Council had successfully financed a new opera house, opened a new arts centre, and there had been support for the Scottish Opera's 10th season and the Scottish National Orchestra's 25th season. "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972, 28.

[340] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972, 33.

items that promoted "Scottishness", such as the tartan, bagpipe, and thistle.[341] Whereas the Welsh Committee had used their position within the Arts Council to demonstrate Wales as a vibrant country fully present in the twentieth century, Scotland would take a different approach, instead focusing on its heritage as a way to show its uniqueness to the British Isles. This can be seen clearly when looking at some of the cultural policies within Scotland and the Scottish Committee, where we see the use of the arts in the commodification of Scottish heritage in the 1970s. The concept of focusing on national heritage and presenting it for economic gain is a concept that was embraced and developed within the Scottish Committee during this period.

As a response to the resurgence in craft and local heritage, the creation of the Crafts Advisory Committee (CAC) in 1971 as a body to "promote and support the concerns of British arts craftsmen" applied directly to Scotland and her indigenous culture and began to establish a market for these goods abroad.[342] The 1970s heralded a revival and reinvention of what crafts were, and what they meant for a local population; an example of which is different tartans to reflect clans and localized identities. Andrea Peach argues in "Craft, Souvenirs and the Commodification of National Identity in 1970s Scotland" that it can be claimed or asserted that "indigenous Scottish craft and its associated iconography had been adopted in Scotland since the Eighteenth Century and continued to be employed as a vehicle for the promulgation of Scottish national identity at home and abroad."[343] This suggests that the Scottish Committee understood how their field functioned and fit into a wider political arena. Looking again at the 1971-1972 Arts Council Annual Report, there is further evidence of using cultural policy in Scotland to enforce a government agenda. Here, the Arts Council states that while much of the work done by the Arts Council (in all nations)

> "reflects and encourages Scottish cultural traditions… People who live in Scotland have as much right of access to the art of the world as anyone else. The periods of Scotland's greatness have been periods when Scotland saw itself as part of Europe, or as part of the then known world."[344]

---

[341] Andrea Peach, "Craft, Souvenirs and the Commodification of National Identity in 1970s Scotland." *Journal of Design History* 20, no. 3 (2007): 243-57. Accessed February 13, 2019. doi:10.1093/jdh/epm015, abstract.
[342] Peach, "Craft Souvenirs", 243.
[343] Peach, "Craft Souvenirs", 244.
[344] "The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972.", 28.

Here, we see a direct link between the government's deploying and funding of an arts policy, and how the arts in Scotland relates to a wider discussion on the geo-political context of this time period: membership of the European Community. Within this we can see localized evidence of connecting British culture with Europe.

The commercialization of Scotland's heritage by a nation during periods of economic hardship and attempts at modernization demonstrates the Scottish Committee's awareness of the importance to stay a relevant and influential part of Britain. This was in part a side-effect of tourism, which was an increasingly important part of Scotland's economy in the 1970s. With a growth in Scottish tourism, the demand for crafts that would enhance and authenticate Scottish travels grew. As souvenirs became semiotic reproductions of tourist's experiences, craft and souvenirs became synonymous with visitors having "a little piece of Scotland."[345] This in turn also created a national identity that could easily be distinguished, something that Wales had not been able to do. As mentioned earlier, the Welsh Committee in a large part devoted their resources towards cultivating a modern and new version of Wales; this vision of which was demonstrated in their patronage of the modern arts and focus on creating suitable venues for the arts to grow in. The Welsh Committee, in an attempt to differentiate themselves from England, chose to focus on Wales as being an equally dynamic and modern player with much to offer. The route taken by the Scottish Committee is markedly different in how the Scottish Committee, while still devoting much of their funds and resources to the visual and performing arts, also had an element of Scottish heritage; embracing their past to show their future. Although the semiotic linking of thistles, tartans, and pipers with constructs of a national identity based on tradition was far from unique to Scotland, its romanticized depiction of traditional symbols (which were not an accurate reflection of modern Scottish life) was useful in asserting its own unique cultural identity. Tourism and heritage became undeniably linked, with tourism fulfilling job creation, craftwork opportunity, and economic gain.[346] This linking of Scotland's past with the arts during a period of economic difficulties (the loss of heavy industry) and, more importantly, during Britain's turn to Europe is another example of when cultural policies and government ambitions overlap.

---

[345] Peach, "Craft Souvenirs", 248.
[346] Peach, "Craft Souvenirs", 245.

4.4: Anglo-European Exchange Programs

Thus far, the chapter has discussed the role of CEMA in promoting, developing, and maintaining the arts in Wartime Britain. In peacetime, CEMA transitioned into the Arts Council, with separate branches in Wales and Scotland. The Welsh Arts Council used their semi-independent position to promote contemporary depictions of Wales, challenging traditional views of the nation as rural and lacking culture. The Scottish Arts Council continued policies set by CEMA and focused on travelling exhibitions and programs, bringing the arts to more remote parts of the nation, and in turn, began to focus on cultivating Scotland's heritage and traditions. Both of these organizations looked for ways to promote their nation as separate from England and following Britain's political transition from the Commonwealth towards Europe in the 1960s, their policies promoted Wales and Scotland's artistic contributions to Europe. Alongside this, there were civic-based Anglo-European exchange programs between the 1950s and 1970s, which reflected cultural exchange programs and policies that were not limited to art exhibitions or festivals. These also occurred during the political shift from the Commonwealth towards Europe and included town twinning schemes and university student exchange programs. Town twinning programs began almost immediately following the Second World War, but an increase in schemes occurred in the 1970s following membership to the European Community. Along with Britain's entry into Europe, British and European universities began student and teacher exchange programs, to encourage multiculturalism and cement bonds between a new generation of Britons and Europeans. This section will discuss these schemes, and their impact and British culture following World War Two, especially in the 1970s, revealing cultural policies during this period that were outside the realms art.

Cultural ties between international cities were aimed at creating a shared culture, and following the Second World War, town twinning contributed to a post-war reimagining of Britain's global presence following the end of empire. The earliest British cities to be twinned with a European city began at the turn of the twentieth century, when Keighley in West Yorkshire became a sister city with Suresnes and Puteaux, France, in 1905.[347] Creating sister cities and town twinning occurred across Europe, Britain, and America, and often matched cities that shared common traits; either sharing names, ethnic origins, or industrial

---

347 Jon Kelly, "Why are towns un-twinning?", *BBC News Magazine*, 5 January 2012.

roles.[348] Town twinning schemes can be divided into two periods: the emergence of town twinning schemes towards the end of the Nineteenth Century and early Twentieth Century; and with more vigor and prominence following the Second World War, when the majority of twinning schemes occurred.[349] The purposes of post-war town twinning were to promote friendship and understanding, and to form special relations between two communities from different countries.[350] As a result of this, twinning schemes in the late 1940s and early 1950s often focused on cities and towns between recently hostile nations, working to establish student and cultural exchange programs, with the mindset that mutual cooperation between foreign cities could survive and minimize disagreements between national governments.[351] Looking at local councils in England that have participated in town twinning provides us with examples of local twinning schemes and their benefits. Woking Council describes the advantages gained from town twinning as the ability to promote an understanding of different cultures and lifestyles, while encouraging an exchange of views and ideas.[352] The Borough of Reigate and Banstead explains the benefits of having sister cities with France and Germany as forging multi-generational friendships over a shared love of sport, culture, and education; and cites international travel and reciprocal visits between cities as a method for achieving this.[353] In Richmond, West London, the borough describes the vital role of town twinning as encouraging social, educational, business, and cultural links between nations; and helping local businesses obtain international contacts.[354]

With many cities gaining sister cities long before Britain formally joined the European Community, cultural ties were already being formed. By twinning cities from nations that had formerly been hostile towards each other, programs and events were put into place to keep the connection between the cities alive and relevant. Often, these included exchange visits between the city's politicians, exchanges in goods and foods and other

---

[348] For additional information on town twinning in countries besides the UK, see: Antoine Vion, "Europe from the Bottom up: Town Twinning in France during the Cold War" (2002).

[349] Nick Clarke, "Town Twinning in Cold-War Britain: (Dis)continuities in Twentieth-Century Municipal Internationalism." *Contemporary British History* 24, no. 2 (April 28, 2010): 173-91. Accessed August 13, 2019. doi:10.1080/13619461003768272., 174.

[350] Woking Council website. "About Town Twinning." About town twinning | Woking Borough Council, March 11, 2020. https://www.woking.gov.uk/council-and-democracy/about-woking/about-town-twinning.

[351] Clarke, "Town Twinning in Cold-War Britain", 175.

[352] Woking Council website. "About Town Twinning."

[353] Banstead, Reigate and. "Town Twinning." Town twinning | Reigate and Banstead. Reigate and Banstead, April 17, 2015. http://www.reigate-banstead.gov.uk/info/20091/organisation_and_services/371/town_twinning.

[354] "Twinning." Visit Richmond. Accessed March 24, 2020. https://www.visitrichmond.co.uk/twinning.aspx

gifts.[355] Promoting visits between communities, sharing gifts and their local culture reflected goals aimed at creating a shared culture, albeit on a small scale. Connections between cities were noted in the press, and generally with positive responses. Evidence of early town twinning schemes can be found in an article from 1946, which discusses the twinning between Perth, Scotland and Perth, Western Australia. The article remarks that the most important reason for town twinning was for "establishing closer understanding between the two countries", and that the twinning ceremonies included multiple exhibits and gifts between the two cities.[356] Other newspaper articles discuss the mutual enjoyment and benefit of visits between cities, and the general agreement that both cities would continue to encourage cultural exchange programs.[357]

        While the exhibits and level of cultural exchange may have been on a much smaller scale than larger, nationwide festivals and programs, their ability to connect international communities and its benefits cannot go unnoticed. Cultural policies relating to town twinning can be found in smaller-scale organizations, such as local museums, heritage centers, city councils, and schools, that promoted the shared culture between Britain and Europe (and the numerous other countries, including in the Americas and Commonwealth). The policies relating to global town twinning created tangible connections between Europe and smaller communities around Britain. The result of this allowed for wider participation with European partners outside of London-based exhibitions and experiences. These connections and their availability were vital because it provided the opportunity for those living outside of London or other major cities to experience first-hand Europe and her culture; being seen in their schools and local community centers. While many of the newspaper articles reported these schemes and activities positively, others took a more negative view. In 1972, city councilors in Harrow, north-west London turned down the opportunity to twin their neighborhood with a similar German town, citing that it would be a waste of money and not meet their objectives. One councilor commented that "while I agree that we have got to look outward more, I do not think that twinning goes anywhere near those objectives."[358] Harrow remarked that if they wanted to expand their international relations, it would be unlikely to find a European town

---

[355]Andreas Langenohl, "The Merits of Reciprocity: Small-Town Twinning in the Wake of the Second World War." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 32, no. 4 (2016): 557–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2016.1244648, 558.
[356] "To Bind Sister Cities", *Dundee Courier,* 15 March 1946.
[357] "After the Town Twinning Success", *Kensington Post*, 18 December 1970.
[358] "Town Twinning Suggestion is Turned Down", *Harrow Observer,* 24 October 1972. This article comments that town twinning would fail to meet Harrow's diversity objectives but fails to list what these objectives were.

that matched Harrow and her needs, and that it would need to find diversity in other sectors; with the suggestion being that schools and organizations should take this initiative upon themselves.[359]

In Harrow's case, the refusal to participate in twinning activity was not due to the want to diversify or forge international relations but was instead due to their borough unlikely being able to find a similar town abroad that reflected their lifestyles. However, it is worth noting and asking if this viewpoint—not wanting to engage in town twinning on the opinion that your city may not find a similar city abroad—is actually instead supporting the notion that communities are insular. Instead of looking for likeness rather than embracing the new world or new way of things, could the concepts of internationalism still be achieved? Harrow Council argued that their international development was still encouraged, but on an individual basis, i.e.: outside of the local council. Looking at Harrow as an example of wanting to develop international relations with other communities, but not engaging with policies around town twinning, new approaches to education were seen as an avenue to develop diversification.

Exploring new opportunities to promote the benefits of belonging to an Anglo-European entity outside of festivals and town twinning included student, teacher, and university exchange programs, all of which emerged rapidly in the 1970s. Inside the classroom, educational schemes included the arts and science; and in the mid-Seventies youth exchange programs started occurring between France and Britain. This also included teacher exchange programs, and a focus on languages being taught in schools.[360] In an article published by the Institute for International Education (IIE, an American organization founded in 1919) in 1961, there were five listed reasons as to why studying abroad and gaining an international education was vital to personal development, as well as the development of a nation. These were: seeing other countries, learning about other peoples and their cultures, the opportunity to learn a foreign language, to pursue a specific field, and to teach or volunteer abroad.[361] The second point made by the IIE about the benefits of receiving education abroad is the most important: the opportunity to learn about other peoples and their cultures. As Britain made her political turn towards Europe, the opportunity to learn about

---

[359] "Town Twinning Suggestion is Turned Down", *Harrow Observer,* 24 October 1972.
[360] TNA, BW 31/63, Anglo-French relations, 1970-1973. This file includes an extensive collection of documents relating to cultural exchange programmes between France, Germany, and the United Kingdom.
[361] Donald J. Shank, "The American Goes Abroad." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 335 (May 1961): 99–111. www.jstor.org/stable/1033261, 99.

other peoples and their culture was another important vehicle in the way culture and society intersected with visions of Europe and modernity. More exposure to European culture was vital to encourage a reimagining seeing Europe as the new world and not the old, and international study and exchange programs, along with town twinning, helped facilitate this shift in perceptions.[362] The teacher and student exchange programs provided this same opportunity to promote Britain as a part of Europe. By providing the tools necessary for individual changes in perspectives and culture across the country, these student and teacher exchange programs promote another version of cosmopolitanism within Britain and in a similar vein to promoting the Commonwealth as a form of modernity, Europe and membership to the Common Market also was promoted as a form of modernity that Britain was now part of.

Academic exchange programs and town-twinning schemes encouraged communities from different parts of Britain and Europe to connect and share opportunities, concerns, and to explore different viewpoints. For British youth, these programs were necessary to foster deeper connections to Europe. From a cultural standpoint, these programs developed a better understanding and involvement in culture—both international and national. From an economic perspective, these programs created new ties with business and international development; all adding to Britain's political influence in the European Community. The cultural policies demonstrated in this section show that cultural policies are not exclusive to the heritage and arts sector and were not always well received (using Harrow as an example of this). Town twinning, student exchange programs, and museum policies may not seem connected, but in actuality they are all examples of a cultural policy that is focused on European integration.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored how cultural policies in Britain were formed and adapted to reflect political and current trends. In discussing the formation of CEMA during the Second World War as a method for promoting, maintaining, and providing accessibility to the arts

---

[362] For more information on student exchange programs outside of the UK, see: Hilary Perraton, "Foreign students in the twentieth century: a comparative study of patterns and policies in Britain, France, Russia and the Unites States" (2017), Hilary Perraton, " Commonwealth Student Exchange 1959-2019: Planned and Unplanned" (2019), Christof van Mol, "Becoming Europeans: the relationships between student exchanges in higher education, European citizenship and a sense of European identity" (2018), and Alessandra Bitumi, "Building Bridges across the Atlantic: The *European Visitors Program*. A Case Study for Public Diplomacy and the Transatlantic Relationship in the 1970s", (2013).

during intense social upheaval, a framework for promoting and enacting British cultural policies was established. Following the transition to the Arts Council of Great Britain in 1946, the independence of the Welsh and Scottish Committees and the directions they took during the 1950s-1970s to promote their nations separate from England provides us with an understanding of periods when cultural policies seemed to align with governmental policies and practices (in this sense, the ambitions of Welsh and Scottish leaders and their aspirations). This also demonstrates how government priorities could be seen to affect the role of the arts and cultural policies and their interactions with society. This was also evidenced by the use of town-twinning schemes and academic exchange programs following Britain's political turn towards Europe.

The next chapter will explore how the Labour party—the originators of CEMA and the Arts Council—used their understanding of an arts policy in promoting their Party's views and aims. The Festivals discussed in this chapter explains the importance of integrating the arts into public policy and decision making and shows how British governments used, understood, and deployed an arts policy to supplement their political aspirations.

<center>**Chapter Five: Festivals of Modernity and Culture**</center>

Introduction

The initiatives established by CEMA and the Arts Council, along with the Welsh Committee and Scottish Committee developed a cultural policy in Britain that provided the maintenance and promotion of culture and heritage, cultural preservation, and accessibility. The Arts Council was a signal point in seeing how the government understood and made use of an arts policy and was a landmark in contemporary British politics. It also provided a vehicle for entities like the Welsh Committee and Scottish Committee to use the arts to support and encourage their own initiatives, like showcasing the two nations as being modern and relevant in post-war Britain, demonstrating periods when politics/ government aspirations overlapped with an arts policy. However, cultural policies were not limited to curating exhibitions or enhancing accessibility to museums; they also apply to government-sponsored festivals centered around the arts and society. This chapter will explain how cultural policies were developed and used in conjunction with wider political aspirations. Using the Festival of Britain, the Festival of Labour, the Commonwealth Arts Festival and the Fanfare for Europe as its examples, this chapter will explain how these government-sponsored festivals promoted aspirational visions of a modern Britain, and how "modern Britain" was interpreted.

5.1 "The Festival of Britain", 1951

In the previous chapter, the role of CEMA and the Arts Council in the maintenance and preservation of British culture and heritage was discussed, establishing that these organizations had a profound impact on British cultural policies in post-war Britain. While the focus of that chapter discussed how government bodies began to understand how an arts policy could be used to cultivate or supplement their own agendas, such as the role of heritage in wartime CEMA programs or the use of heritage by the Scottish Committee, governments would also turn towards festivals to promote their own interests. An example of this is the previously mentioned Festival of Britain.

Conceived by Britain's first Labour-majority government, the Festival would promote loudly the modern age of post-war Britain, and her influential role in the world; examples of which would be found in nearly every exhibition hosted during the Festival, but also in its modern contemporary design. The integration of modern architecture, interior design, and art within the Festival, and the message this was attempting to portray, would be

just as important as the politics behind the festival. The Festival of Britain too would use modern design to both present Britain as a nation at the forefront of global politics and also celebrate a lingering, wartime sense of British exceptionalism. Designed to provide a tonic for the still rationed and austere Britons who, six years from VE Day, were still living with the hardships of the past, it was hoped that the Festival would create a new narrative on Britain's image and role. The Festival of Britain not only celebrated British exceptionalism and her influences across the globe (with few exceptions like India, much of Britain's colonial empire remained intact, albeit fracturing); but also set new standards in design and good living, which can also be interpreted as a presentation of Labour's optimistic vision for post-war Britain. The modernist designs unveiled at the Festival of Britain would set the trend for British aesthetics for the next decade. In the same way that Britain would use her position within the Commonwealth of Nations as a new and dynamic union in comparison to the United Nations and the European Economic Community, the Festival helped to signaled Britain's modernity and global position.

The Festival of Britain was one of the first major public events following the end of the Second World War, taking place over six months in 1951.[363] Occurring on the centenary of the Great Exhibition in 1851, the Festival of Britain was conceptualized as "a commercial and cultural showcase for the promotion of trade and edification of the people".[364] The Festival demonstrated the role of culture and technology in constructing both a new British-Commonwealth centric identity, but also a modernist approach to living in the new post-war decade.

Ideas for the Festival of Britain emerged as early as 1943, but failed to gain any sort of traction until after the end of the Second World War.[365] When planning for the Festival finally commenced in 1949, the exhibitions were conceived to be not only a celebration of Britain's victory in the Second World War, but also a proclamation of its national recovery under Labour (details about rationing and austerity were ignored).[366] It was also hoped by Labour MPs that the Festival would once again see Britain "coming to life", commenting that the Government would "be proud if the Festival uplifts the spirits and imagination of the

---

[363] Other events include the 1946 Victory Parade in London, Princess Elizbeth's wedding in 1947, and the 1948 Olympics, held in London.

[364] Barry Turner, *Beacon for Change: How the Festival of Britain Shaped the Modern Age*. (London: Aurum Press LTD, 2011), 1.

[365] TNA, WORK 25/8

[366] Becky E. Conekin, *The Autobiography of a Nation: The 1951 Festival of Britain*. (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 4.

British people after such a long spell of danger and austerity."[367] Furthermore, the Festival was a government strategy to increase foreign tourism and interest in Britain, which would enhance her political presence post-war, yet themes within the Festival de-emphasized Britain's imperial past, again demonstrating that the focus of the festival was on Britain's future.[368]

While still in the early stages of planning the Festival, the committee (headed by Labour cabinet minister Herbert Morrison) realized that the cost of the Festival would exceed their £12 million budget; and the inclusion of the Commonwealth was determined to be one of the factors in exceeding costs.[369] Perhaps due to the increasing costs, we can see the conflicting decisions between the Festival focusing on Britain's imperial legacy, and her post-austerity future.

The initial plans were to incorporate the Commonwealth and Empire as much as possible into the Festival. This was a deliberate political decision: the inclusion of the Empire would directly reference the Great Exhibition in 1851 and show the longevity—and therefore success—of the British Empire. With India recently gaining independence, this inclusion was necessary. The committee originally considered asking the Commonwealth to provide materials to build the Festival, but for various reasons decided against it. [370] In a letter to the Lord President of the Council dated July 11, 1949, the direction of the Festival's theme was determined. The letter remarked that

> "Due to shortages of manpower and materials, the Festival of Britain is not able to invite Commonwealth institutions to arrange for pavilions or other displays in the exhibitions; but Commonwealth Governments have been invited to support events and attend. The Festival will focus on the contribution of the UK to civilization."[371]

---

[367] "1951 Festival of Britain", *The Scotsman*, 11 February 1949. The selected quotes are taken from Herbert Morrison.

[368] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 26.

[369] TNA CAB 124/1220, British Commonwealth Participation- Festival of Britain 1951. This file contains correspondences between government ministers and the Committee in charge of planning the Festival of Britain, as well as promotional information and general information regarding the Festival. For additional information, I found Historic UK's article by Ben Johnson "The Festival of Britain 1951" useful, as well as The History Press's article by the same name. These can be found at https://www.thehistorypress.co.uk/articles/the-festival-of-britain-1951/ and https://www.historic-uk.com/HistoryUK/HistoryofBritain/The-Festival-of-Britain-1951/.

[370] TNA CAB 124/1220

[371] TNA CAB 124/1220 Letter to Lord President of the Council, July 11, 1949.

This letter shows that while the Commonwealth was to be included, it would not be a main focus. Britain's Empire would not be the main focus, either, but Britain's imperial legacy would feature heavily throughout the Festival, notably in themes around exploration and discovery; but also, in exhibitions on Britain's national character (as seen within the Lion and Unicorn Pavilion). By September 1949, the Foreign Office supported the decision to not focus solely on the Commonwealth or Empire but instead on Britain's contributions towards discovery and developing (colonizing) countries across the globe, remarking:

> "…it would be a mistake to single out our contribution to the development of the United States of America; but that he [Secretary of State Bevin] considered it very important to show our contribution in the last three hundred years or so, not only to discovering, opening up and developing the world (particularly of course the Empire and United States), but also in the sphere of political ideas and political development, leading towards self-government; we should draw attention to our contribution in the spheres of language, parliamentary system, legal system, etc, etc. He [Bevin] said he would much like to see the "exhibition" illustrating this latter theme."[372]

The support for this—using the Festival to celebrate Britain and her global influence—is also seen in a letter from the Colonial Office in September 1949: "We in the Colonial Office warmly endorse the view that it is of the greatest importance to show Britain's contributions in the field of Colonial development."[373] Ultimately, Canada and other Commonwealth countries provided some materials, but largely Commonwealth countries organized their own sections showcasing their contributions to the arts and sciences. Politically, the Festival of Britain showcased the United Kingdom and its influences around the world, and included Commonwealth countries and their individual influences in the arts, sciences, and technology. Press commentary from 1949 remarked that while this was the theme, except for where the historical record was necessary, all exhibitions would promote contemporary themes and ideas, instead of nostalgically focusing on Britain's imperial past.[374] While not a primary focus of the Festival, the inclusion of Commonwealth countries and their social impacts can be seen as a marker in the understanding of the British

---

[372] TNA CAB 124/1220 This is a letter from the Foreign Office to the Government about the Festival of Britain, dated September 5, 1949.
[373] TNA CAB 124/1220, British Commonwealth Participation- Festival of Britain 1951
[374] "1951 Festival of Britain: Compiling Stock Lists of Exhibits", *Londonderry Sentinel*, 13 October 1949.

government on the importance of the Commonwealth, especially as the transition from Empire to Commonwealth had begun; as well as understanding how to use an arts policy to underscore their political aspirations.

The geopolitics of the era provides us with an understanding of the importance of the inclusion of the Commonwealth. Only a few years previously, India had gained independence; and Ireland had exited from the Commonwealth of Nations. Mutterings of decolonization were beginning to sweep across much of Britain's empire. Britain found herself bankrupt from years of war and was beginning to realize that she could not maintain her imperial influence. As discussed in chapter two, the role of the Commonwealth and decolonization would emerge as some of the largest political trends of the two decades following the Second World War, with exhibitions and festivals that promoted the Commonwealth as a dynamic and modern union; similar to the United Nations and EEC. While the Festival of Britain would have political aims that hoped to show how Labour would propel Britain into the future, in many respects, it was the aesthetics of the Festival that were the true influence on the modernity of 1950s Britain.

The Festival of Britain took pride in Britain's past, but largely focused on Britain's bright future (artistically, economically, politically), which is evident in the designs seen throughout the Festival and its locations. The site chosen for the Festival was London's South Bank. Today, we know this area as a thriving cultural venue, but in 1949, the site was comprised of warehouses, working class accommodation, and bomb sites waiting to be rebuilt.[375] The designers for the Festival were encouraged to "do more than display the best that Britain could offer" and were "encouraged to make a new contribution to the post-war world by solving some of the problems that faced us", such as unemployment, austerity measures, and poor living conditions.[376] This optimistic approach to *solving the world's problems* is reflected in the Festival architects and designers who were keen to "create a large-scale change in the British public tastes", whose objectives were to "dispel the fussy, old fashioned [designs of the past] replacing them with simple, clean lines for the interior and exterior and household objects."[377] Many of the designers and planners of the festival looked towards designing the Festival with the sense of newness and modernity that the Festival was

---

[375] TNA WORK 25/48. This file contains documents relating to planning and operations for the Festival of Britain, largely focused on the South Bank site.
[376] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 35.
[377] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 49.

trying to encompass: "…war service followed by austerity meant that most of the Festival's architects and planners saw the 1951 Festival as their first real chance to design and build modern structures in Britain"[378] The designers employed by the Festival were unique in the sense that many of them received their formal training and education during the interwar period, but due to the war, they had not been able to explore their talents fully. The aesthetics of the Festival reflect this excitement and engagement with design, with many buildings and furnishings having 1930s art deco and Scandinavian traits that were popular during the interwar period.[379]

The new buildings and structures built specially for the Festival were influenced by the festival's themes and were adapted to make each space unique, while being unified under a common theme of modernity. The Festival's exhibitions were themed around Britain's character, Britain's landscape, and British design and industry; and in keeping with the guidance given to the Festival's designers to explore the best of British design and remove any vestiges to the past, the buildings and interior spaces lacked any of the ornamentation seen in Victorian architecture.[380] The Dome of Discovery, built on the current location of the Jubilee Gardens, Lambeth, was the largest dome in the world when opened, and featured themes of discovery and exploration. The exhibitions within the Dome included the New World, the seas, polar regions, the sky, and space. The exhibitions that focused on the sky and space satisfied the theme of modernity, and her exhibitions devoted to exploration, discovery, and the New World reflected Britain's influence on their colonial and Commonwealth legacies, as necessitated by the Festival Committee in 1949.[381] A large part of the Festival of Britain was themes focusing on Britain's industry and technology, and the

---

[378] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 36.

[379] It is also worth noting that there were also designers who contributed to the Festival's design and aesthetic who were refugees to Britain, or whose families had emigrated during their childhood. This is a topic that is discussed by academic Harriet Atkinson. In a lecture given to *Insiders Outsiders* on May 5th, 2021, Atkinson references a variety of designers who contributed to the Festival. These included those who had fled Nazism in the 1930s from Germany, Austria, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Amongst those discussed is Czech textile designer Jacquline Groag who fled to Britain in 1938, and whose designs from the 1940s heavily inspired the Festival. Atkinson also discusses Abram Games, who was born in London to Jewish parents who had fled Russia; Games designed the iconic emblem of the Festival that was featured on almost all advertising, signage, and ephemera. Another designer discussed in Misha Black, who served on the Festival design team and contributed to much of the Festival's buildings, who was a refugee from Baku (modern-day Azerbaijan). This topic is relatively overlooked when discussing the Festival of Britain, but it does give an interesting perspective on the different types of design influence that contributed to the Festival. The talk can be found on *Insiders Outsiders* youtube page, here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GfITkHvohxU

[380] "The Festival of Britain 1951." The History Press. Accessed February 5, 2020. https://www.thehistorypress.co.uk/articles/the-festival-of-britain-1951/.

[381] "The Festival of Britain 1951." The History Press.

role science played within this; all of which can be found within the exhibitions housed inside the Dome of Discovery.

The use of science is especially noteworthy, as it was central to the modernism (showing Britain's embrace of technology and future progress) of the Festival. Playing into this concept of science and space exploration as examples of the new era Britain was entering, the Festival used variations of the scientific aesthetic when furnishing and decorating the buildings within the Festival complex. This included atomic designs on the tableware and furnishings at the Festival's restaurants; and within the Dome of Discovery, the galleries featured atomic structures and snowflakes leading to the comment "everything is made from atoms" in the official guidebook.[382] The use of science is clearly illustrated in its use within architecture and design. Furthermore, within the Dome was a large mural by artist Keith Vaughn on the themes of discovery. The mural itself was destroyed during the Dome's demolition, and while no images exist of the piece, a study does remain, giving insight to the modern post-war artistic themes within the Dome.[383] Also noteworthy is the point made in chapter four that many of the artworks commissioned by the Festival received their funding from the Arts Council. This is important because it again shows the role of the Arts Council in making the arts more accessible and providing greater growth and opportunities for engagement. In this case, it is the use and employment of artists (both celebrated and novice) to create artworks for a vast audience, which provides insight into the types of conversations that were beginning to emerge, demonstrating the State's awareness for the necessity to sponsor artists (the Arts Council receiving substantial government funding to support the Festival of Britain, as discussed in the previous chapter). Politically, the use of science within Festival provides insight into Attlee, Morrison, the Festival Committee and Labour's agenda for bringing a scientific and modern version of the future in Britain. The exhibitions represented only one of the ways Britain post-war could be imagined, but the emphasis was placed on a modern and improving country that was on par with other superpowers in the new world order.[384]

---

[382] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 57.

[383] Sold in 2017, the study for this lost mural is a rare example of the artwork contained within the Dome of Discovery. Sotheby's catalogue also contains images of Vaughn painting the original mural. For more: Keith Vaughn, *Study for At The Beginning of Time/ Theseus*, Sotheby's, lot 127. 21-22 November 2017. http://www.sothebys.com/en/auctions/ecatalogue/lot.127.html/2017/modern-post-war-british-art-l17143

[384] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 73.

The Dome of Discovery was just one of the buildings that was influenced by the Festival's themes. The Royal Festival Hall—the only building to survive today—was constructed as a large concert hall, with multiple levels whose architecture and interior décor were also influenced by an atomic, modernist design. Celebrated post-war designer Robin Day was tasked with creating the futuristic furniture found within the concert hall. Day's chairs, described as "swan-like curves and wide proportions"[385] were crafted from bent woods and copper. Dubbed the *Royal Festival Hall Chair*, they became popular outside of the Festival and inspired many mid-century designs. Other buildings included the Telekinema, built to showcase innovations in cinema and television. Designed by Wells Coats, the building mixed metals, glass, and concrete in striking linear designs. The Telekinema was operated by the British Film Institute (BFI) and the venue could accommodate large-screen television, film, and 3-D films and was overwhelming popular with Festival goers. Due to its popularity, the Telekinema remained in use as a cinema club within the BFI, until the building was demolished in 1957. Today, the National Theatre occupies the site.[386] Other attractions across London included the "Exhibition of Science" at the Science Museum, and the Battersea Pleasure Gardens, which was a fun-fair and amusement park.

Along with the Royal Festival Hall's furnishings designed by Robin Day, there were contributions from Ernest Race, who designed the *Springbok* and *Antelope* chairs for the Festival. The furnishings by Race continued to be produced until the 1970s, owing to their popularity and overall simplistic design. The London department store Heal's also contributed to the Festival by having Andrew John Milne design stackable chairs for use within the Festival grounds, and, like Day and Race's designs, continued to be produced long after the Festival's end.[387] Textiles designer Lucienne Day used her futuristic atomic designs on fabric and wallpaper and was also displayed in Homes and Gardens Pavilion. Her pattern *Calyx* went on to become one of her most commercially successful patterns, sold at Heal's; and she would go on to become one of the most successful textile designers of the 1950s and 1960s. Other designers like Joyce Clissold and John Barker would have successful careers based off their Festival designs.[388]

---

[385] Located within the Victoria and Albert Museum's online archives, images of the furnishings, their design and descriptions allow insight into the clean, elegant lines that categorises the Royal Festival Hall. "V&A · The Festival of Britain." Victoria and Albert Museum. Accessed February 5, 2020. https://www.vam.ac.uk/articles/the-festival-of-britain.

[386] "The Festival of Britain 1951." The History Press.

[387] "V&A · The Festival of Britain."

[388] "V&A · The Festival of Britain."

In looking at the design of the Festival, we see the overall embrace of modernism, a concept mentioned earlier that was enthusiastically supported by the Festival Director Gerald Barry.[389] Under the direction of Hugh Casson as Director of Architecture, he and his staff used the Festival of Britain to promote a modernist approach to designing spaces, using central London as the model. The designs were meant to showcase "clean, bold lines" as a "satisfying amalgam of practicality and beauty".[390] With the Festival designers being given the mission to "create a large-scale change in the British public tastes" by Casson and Barry, the aesthetics of the Festival were shaped to bring the best ideas of European Modernism to Britain, bringing the "new" to England, showing what the future could be like.[391] To further visually showcase the new and contemporary Britain that the Festival was promoting, Barry and Casson also emphasized lighting the Festival at night to contrast with the recent wartime blackout.[392] The inspiration for the Festival design did have American influences, but was also heavily inspired by Nordic pre-war exhibitions, with some German influences. Casson used the 1930 Stockholm Exhibition's forward-thinking design and layout as an inspiration for a modern design with egalitarian approaches to society and social settings.[393] This is evident in the large, open spaces with clean, unobstructed lines; void of any Victorian or other outdated ornamentation.[394]

If we look at images from the buildings, restaurants, and furnishings within the 1930 exhibition, the parallels to the 1951 exhibition are numerous. The Swedish exhibition popularized modernist design, functionality, and promoted the benefits of a modernized approach to life demonstrated through social change; the Festival of Britain took this same approach when curating exhibitions focused on modern living and housing standards. This is demonstrated when examining one of the most popular attractions within the Festival: Homes and Gardens Pavilion. In this space, the modernistic appearance of appliances and living spaces were another specifically curated visual contrast to the drab wartime living that many

---

[389] Julian Hendy and Michael Proudfoot, *"1951 Festival of Britain: A Brave New World"*. United Kingdom: BBC Two, 2011. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Vmzq1s7xgE.

[390] Turner, *Beacon of Change*, 31.

[391] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 35.

[392] *"1951 Festival of Britain: A Brave New World"*

[393] Turner, *Beacon of Change*, 31.

[394] Located within the National Archives are selections of Festival ephemera, whose colourful maps, posters, and brochures feature bold, clean lines and designs. These items are unmistakably modern, with little to no references to "traditional" design or décor. Regardless of personal taste, the average Briton viewing these items would have felt a wave of optimism for the Britain of the future. For more, see: WORK 25/224. These documents were catalogued following the closure of the Festival of Britain Office in 1953 and were transferred to the Ministry of Works.

had experienced. Modern design in the 1950s was part of a campaign to promote "good design" by architects, designers, and manufacturers; and had its origins in the Victoria and Albert Museum's 1946 exhibition "Britain Can Make it".[395] This popular exhibition contained over 5000 examples of consumer goods that were produced by British manufacturers and contained a series of exhibitions that displayed a series of living spaces with modern furnishings. Within these exhibitions, the "Furnished Rooms Section" was the most popular feature within "Britain Can Make It" and helped pave the way for and provide inspiration for the Festival of Britain's exhibitions within the Home and Gardens Pavilion.[396]

The contemporary designs featured within this pavilion was a mixture of historical British design, but also contemporary European designs. Neo-Georgian styles found in the Home and Gardens Pavilion characterized the 1950s, which was manifested in both the exterior designs of new buildings, but also within sleek new furniture, such as the tapered legs on sofas and chairs, and streamlined furniture that rejected Victorian over-stuffed upholstery and clutter. While this style was influenced by British designs dating back almost 200 years, the lighter, airy designs reflected the new era of opportunity for social advancement and material affluence and cast off the dark colors and clutter of the previous decades.[397] Some of the modern British designs that debuted at the Festival were textiles with atomic designs, blonde wood furniture, cane work for indoor furniture instead of garden/ conservatories, and exposed lightbulb lamps such as the "lily of the valley" light fixtures.[398] These designs echoed those found within Scandinavian designs, which also embraced lighter colors and softer materials.[399] By bringing design and daily life back into color and adding style to functionality; design and consumerism mixed to make living exciting, and new. We also see this in the Living Exhibition, at the Lansbury Estate in Poplar, where the purposed planning for a better way of life was demonstrated in housing. The benefits of modern and futuristic planning were making cities enjoyable again and promoted Labour's manifestos on leisure and good living, just as in Britain's European counterparts.

Another, more prominent, embrace of a modern post-war Britain was not only found in the futuristic furniture and fabric designs throughout the Festival, but also within the visual

---

[395] Christopher Breward, Fiona Fisher, Ghislane Wood, *British Design: Tradition and Modernity after 1948*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 72. "Good design" in this sense refers to "simple, good quality, and value for money", as well as convenience and accessibility.
[396] Breward, *British Design*, 72.
[397] Breward, *British Design*, 72.
[398] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 51.
[399] Breward, *British Design*, 18.

appearance of the Festival's promotional material. Marketing materials and advertisements for the Festival featured bright colors and bold designs which, much like the emphasis on lighting, was another contrast to the bleak wartime years. In examining the décor, theme, and overall architectural styles within the Festival, we can clearly identify the Festival's embrace of modern design and its accompanying themes suggesting future prosperity for Britain, and her realms, following the Second World War. While the Festival of Britain featured themes of Britain, her identity, her role in the wider world—including the Commonwealth and Empire—it was her design that affected the public psyche more than the displays of science and exploration that promoted Britain's influence on the developing world. This also included designs for modern living. The Festival's modernist stylings, many of which were largely influenced by Scandinavian designs, suggests that there was an understanding amongst those planning the Festival that it was possible to influence Britain with ideas of newness and modernity. An example of this could be seen in the commercial popularity of the designs.[400] If measuring the impact of the Festival on popularity with the public, it can be suggested that Hugh Casson and Gerald Barry's ambition to bring the "new" from Europe to Britain had been a success due to their designs influencing a decade of British interior design and aesthetics.[401]

As seen in this section, the lasting legacy of the Festival of Britain was her optimistic embrace of the new post-war era, and how the Festival's designers sought to create an environment void of any ornamentations or references to the past. Naturally, Britain's past and her imperial legacy—concepts of British exceptionalism—were represented throughout the Festival, being found in her exhibitions on exploration and discovery, and Britain's national character. But also, in the role Britain played influencing global development, which

---

[400] For more information on the designs within the Festival of Britain, and her wider impact, see: F.M. Leventhal *"A Tonic to the Nation": The Festival of Britain, 1951* (1995); H.F. Clark *"Landscape in London's Festival of Britain"* (1951); Sophie Forgan, *Festivals of Science and the Two Cultures: Science, Design and Display in the Festival of Britain, 1951* (1998); and Mariel Grant *"Working for the Yankee Dollar": Tourism and the Festival of Britain as a Stimuli for Recovery* (2006).
[401] Susanna Walker's book *1950s Modern: British Style and Design* (2012) argues that the design aesthetics we associate with the 1950s can largely be attributed to the Festival of Britain. She argues that the 1950s was the first decade where Britain really embraced modern design, associating this to the austerity of the Second World War. She also comments that improved technologies and innovations with building standards and appliances contributed to the new, contemporary style that starkly contrasted to the worn and dated living standards that many Britons occupied. Walker argues that the "contemporary style" established by the Festival of Britain remained popular throughout the 1950s due to its representation of a brighter and better future, often in contrast to drab Victorian designs and harshly mended wartime furnishings and buildings. By the end of the 1950s, the contemporary styles debuted at the Festival was the dominating trend in interior design across Britain's department stores and homes.

was seen in exhibitions on the New World and the inclusion of the Commonwealth of Nations. But in the Festival's exhibitions on home interiors and design, as well as the use of art through the Festival buildings, we can clearly see how the projects within the Festival of Britain were in line with the Labour Party's social democratic views in the late 1940s, which can be described as "diffusing knowledge through popular education, encouraging people to take part in "culture" in their leisure time, improving their material surroundings, stimulating the arts, broadly fostering an enlightened citizenry rich in culture", demonstrating Attlee's attempts of incorporating the arts into government policy .[402]

The use of Arts Council funded artists to create artworks for the Festival, as well as the heavy importance of art and design in creating the Festival gives great insight to arts and culture intersecting with society. The Festival of Britain combined leisure with education, and the arts with innovation. The modernism found within the Festival severed as a manifesto for how life in post-war Britain would look and took inspiration from Europe. A decade later, the Festival of Labour would again incorporate these themes and ideals when planning for Labour's future for Britain, further integrating the arts with politics and society.

5.2: "Festival of Labour", 1962

This section will explore further how governments, or in this example, political parties, developed an arts policy and understood the benefits in intersecting arts and culture with society. This thesis has already discussed how the Labour government under Attlee transitioned CEMA into the Arts Council of Great Britain, and repurposed and incorporated CEMA's wartime programs into daily, post-war life. Some of the first legislation put forth by Attlee built the framework for managing and developing post-war Britain, which included legislation directly relating to the arts. With the Arts Council being used as an official agent of the government for its support of the arts, along with the Local Government Act of 1948 (an act which gave local governments the ability to collect tax strictly for the support of the arts), the new Arts Council fitted into the Labour Government's commitment to the Welfare State by not only providing health and housing provisions, but also provisions for intellectual and imaginative aspects of life.[403] We saw this commitment to the Welfare State for providing quality health, housing, and artistic aspects of life directly in the Festival of Britain, notably in the Homes and Gardens Pavilion but also in the Lansbury Estate and overall

---

[402] Conekin, *Autobiography of a Nation*, 49.
[403] Marwick, *British Society Since 1945*, 53.

modern aesthetic of the Festival. We also see this in the Festival of Labour. The Festival of Labour in 1962 was a political rally focused on reviving the Labour Party, which had at that point been in opposition for a decade. The Festival of Labour, like Labour's earlier Festival of Britain, incorporated the arts and modernism into all aspects of the Festival, in hopes to repaint the Labour Party as being new and modern, and relevant to Britain in the 1960s.

Occurring across three days in June 1962, the Festival of Labour was designed as a political rally with the intention of refocusing and refreshing the Labour party, to reengage with contemporary politics and society. Labour had been in opposition since 1951, having lost three general elections in the 1950s. It seemed that Labour had lost its ability to unite voters and gain enough support to win general elections, and therefore the party needed to re-establish itself as a key player in British politics. We see this clearly in Anthony Crosland's *The Future of Socialism*. Crosland's views were that Labour was too focused on the issues of the past and didn't focus on, or wasn't aware of, the issues concerning the present. This, Crosland claims, was the reason for Labour's successive electoral defeats since the 1951 General Election. He feared that Labour in the mid-Fifties was unable to give a clear answer or direction on its purpose in British politics and society.[404] Crosland argued passionately the need for the Labour party to "stop searching for fresh inspiration in the old orthodoxies" and fighting lost battles, and that only by acknowledging the social and cultural change that had occurred in Britain (both during the Second World War and in the years after), could the Labour party again win voters and general elections.[405] Crosland noted that while some traditional Labour industries had given Labour its initial support, the party needed to embrace modern socialism and apply it to all aspects of living.[406] The development of a classless, egalitarian society and the elimination of "residual social distress" in Britain are two main points that Crosland felt should be the focus of the post-war, post-Attlee Labour party.[407] Crosland asserts that a lack of social amenities, amongst many other things, shows a failure in Labour using socialism to create a brighter, better Britain. In drawing comparisons again with

---

[404] Anthony Crosland, *The Future of Socialism: The Book that Changed British Politics*. (London: Constable, 2006). This is a newer edition, with a forward by former Labour PM Gordon Brown, and an afterword by Crosland's wife, Susan Crosland. The main text remains original to its 1956 publication.
[405] Crosland, *Socialism*, 71.
[406] A good comparison of the Labour party in the 1950s to the Labour Party under Corbyn (2015-2020), and how Crosland's lessons are still relevant today is: "The Future of British Social Democracy: Lessons from Anthony Crosland by Patrick Diamond, September 19, 2016. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/the-crosland-legacy-the-future-of-british-social-democracy/ .
[407] Crosland, *Socialism,* 86-87. Crosland describes the "residual social distress" that still plagues Britain as "ugly towns, mean streets, slum houses, overcrowded schools, inadequate hospitals, under-staffed mental institutions, too few homes for the aged…and often a squalid, lack of social amenities".

the Festival of Britain, Labour needed to be able to reconnect with voters and convince them that under Labour, Britain would have a brighter future. The Festival of Labour was the opportunity to do so.

Planning for the Festival of Labour began while the party was in opposition, in July 1960. The original idea for the festival was conceived by the General Secretary of the Labour Party, Morgan Phillips, and planning commenced under the leadership of Merlyn Rees. Rees, in 1960, was not yet an MP and had been appointed by Philips directly to organize the Festival.[408] Planning for the festival was soon approved by the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party and the task of developing the Festival into a physical event began in 1961.[409] Events planned for the three-day festival included political speeches, a tableaux float parade, and numerous arts exhibitions. The incorporation of the art exhibitions is reminiscent of the Festival of Britain's use of artists and designers to create exhibitions focusing around a newer, more contemporary Britain, and also showed the importance of supporting the intellectual aspects of a welfare state, and safe and affordable healthy living. These events included: exhibitions dedicated to handicrafts, town planning, and health services; children's artworks, a "Prints of the World" exhibition; and musical performances including renditions by the Welsh Miners Choir, a concert by the Musician's Union, and both a jazz concert and classical concert at the Royal Festival Hall.[410] The exhibition on town planning showcased housing and European-style redevelopment schemes across Scotland, England and Wales and was accompanied by a selection of educational films.[411] This echoes the Festival of Britain's town planning exhibitions, especially the Live Architecture planning in Poplar, which aimed to show more efficient and modern building and housing practices. In a similar vein, the National Coal Board featured an exhibition of a model coal mine, which had been previously exhibited at the Stockholm Exhibition in 1930; the same exhibition that served as inspiration for the Festival of Britain.[412]

Morgan Philips described the Festival of Labour as demonstrating the Labour party as being "concerned not only with the material advantages of life but also with its quality—that material prosperity is a basis on which to build a truly socialist society richly filled with good

---

[408] LAP, NAD/FOL/1/2.

[409] NAD/FOL/1/2, Press Conference, 30 April 1962.

[410] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/2, events catalogue.

[411] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/8. The cities featured in the town planning exhibition were: Birmingham, Bristol, Coventry, Glasgow, London, Newcastle, Norwich, Sheffield, Southampton, Swansea; the exhibition was designed by Alan Irving.

[412] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/8.

things of civilization."[413] This echoes Crosland's views on socialism and Labour, and how it connects with and can benefit British society, in particular the need for further developing social amenities and the intellectual and imaginative aspects of the Welfare State.[414] This political rally promoted the arts and industry, and Labour's long support for unions, which would "show the nation that we [Labour] are a forward-looking movement that can take its politics into unusual fields."[415]With the expected nature of hosting a political rally in the form as a public festival, the event was hoped by organizers to "mark the renaissance of the Labour Party as a force to be reckoned with…[becoming a] springboard from whence the Party will move towards victory at the next election."[416] In planning the Festival, organizers sought to connect their public policies with the arts, better living, and leisure.

In his 1961 work *Signpost for the Sixties*, Labour MP Peter Shore argued that Labour must cement a relationship between socialism and science in order to improve lives, wages, and Britain's global presence and influence. Two years later, Harold Wilson—then leader of the Labour Party—presented in his conference speech at Scarborough how the new Britain would be forged in the white heat revolution of science and technology; all of which would create economic growth for lower classes, increasing access to education, leading to a more socialist, classless society.[417] Wilson's references on the positive impact science would have on society included telling Britons that under Labour, a "brain drain" to America caused by

---

[413] LPA, NAD/ FOL/ 1/3.

[414] It is also worth noting that other European Social Democratic parties were, in the 1950s, having discussions around revising the Left, with conversations less about the merits of unionship that had shaped early 20th Century liberal politics and more about inclusion and classless states. An example of this can be found in Denmark. In 1949, a group of Danish trade unionists visited America and was able to see American concepts of productivity and social security. Part of this influence came from the Marshall Plan, which affected most of Europe and, aside from financial assistance, had the option to heavily influence politics and decision-making with an American perspective. Sissel Bjerrum Fossat discusses that, after World War Two, America was seen as the incarnation of modernity, and Europeans measured their success against the American way of life. There were some agreements on productivity, but many European nations rejected American views on social rights, such as segregation and race. This is discussed in Fossat's 2010 article "'We Have A Lot to Learn!': American Influences on Danish Social Democracy and Organised Labour in the Early 1950s: Transnational Perspectives". Other articles that discuss the shifts in social democracy and political thought on the Left include Brian Shaev, "Nationalism, transnationalism and European socialism in the 1950s: a comparison of the French and German cases" (2019), which discusses how socialist parties in France and Germany responded and, at times, adapted towards events that were occurring in the 1950s, including European reconstruction, decolonization, the Cold War, and the EEC. While these are just two articles, they do point towards a wider notion of social democratic political parties in the 1950s understanding their need to develop and modernize with the times, and how they responded to wider changes across the geo-political arena. Aspects of Crosland's views were in-line with what others in his position were thinking, and enacting, across Europe during this period.

[415] LPA, NAD/ FOL/ 1/3; letter from Morgan Phillips to Labour members. The vision of "taking politics into unusual fields" can refer to science and industry but is unspecified.

[416] LPA, NAD/ FOL/ 1/3.

[417] LPA, Labour Party, Box 3; "Labour's Plan for Science, Conference Speech by Harold Wilson".

(an implied Conservative government) failure to recognize a rapidly changing world (due to advances in science and technology) would not continue as there would be more—and better—opportunities at home than abroad, asserting that Labour was more efficient and forward-looking than the more aristocratic approaches to politics on offer from Alec Douglas-Home. Wilson's famed speech occurred one year after the Festival of Labour, and while Wilson's speech does not directly discuss the role of art in creating this new prosperous Britain, there were already publications from the Labour party in the late 1950s that discussed the role of the arts, which can be interpreted as a cultural version of Wilson's use of technology and modern industry in creating a prosperous society. This can be seen in the next section, where we can see the development and promotion of the arts as being core to Labour's mandate that within a Welfare State, the intellectual and imaginative aspects of life also need to be provided for by the State.

Throughout the 1940s to 1970s, Labour often used "leisure" and "the arts" interchangeably. Labour's election manifestos and official publications during these decades promoted leisure as being heavily impacted by the role of the arts. Unsurprisingly, Labour also encouraged patronage in the arts by the common Briton, which Labour felt would help to cultivate a more cultured, egalitarian society. As noted in *Leisure for Living*, a pamphlet produced by Labour in 1959, the party remarked that "as the appreciation of art becomes more widely diffused, more and more people, of varying means, will consider that the purchase of a picture as natural as the purchase of a chair", asserting that Labour wanted the use and appreciation of the arts to be fully integrated into daily life.[418] Labour's earlier political focus on reduced working hours and better living conditions, it was argued, had led to developing most Briton's ability to enjoy leisure activities, with examples being given as visits to museums and galleries, festivals, long holidays; and also reading, writing poetry and short stories, and listening to music after work. The Party's continued understanding of the importance of having an arts policy that encouraged leisure activities, and further explanations on why support of arts and artists was needed and how it connected to the Labour Party can be found in the Party's archives. The archives contain a document—a short article—entitled: "The Art Exhibition is in Connection with the Labour Party Festival of the Arts". Written at the start of the Festival in June 1962, the decision to focus on the arts, and why it mattered, is illustrated. It explains that the "aim of the festival is to draw special attention to Labour's future participation in the encouragement and sponsorship of the

---

[418] "Leisure for Living", The Labour Party, October 1959, 10.

arts."[419] The document continues to explain how the artist in Britain compares to the use of arts in society in Europe.

> "The artist remains <u>unused</u> on public works to a deplorable extent, as compared to his colleagues in France, Holland, and the USA and Latin America. For instance, there is only one example in London of the work of Henry Moore, our greatest living sculptor, incorporated in the architecture of a building erected since the war."[420]

This statement points to an understanding within Labour of arts and culture intersecting with society as signals of a more developed and modern nation. Like Crosland's rhetoric on a needed shift within Labour and her policies, this also shows a shift in rhetoric on understanding how Britain is placed in the world, by making comparisons of Britain's cultural presence with that of her closest economic partners.

In the discussion within "The Art Exhibition is in Connection with the Labour Party Festival of the Arts", Labour's use and patronage of the arts, as well as the argument that many of the public places where people spend the majority of their time are void of culture, is explained. Labour suggests that these spaces are "either unrelieved by works of art or garnished with interior decorations grudgingly added without proper attention to the serious purpose the visual arts can serve in the life of the community".[421] In Labour's sponsorship of the arts, we see a support for creating more enjoyable spaces for work, living, and relaxation. As early as 1959, Labour was publishing pamphlets and material on the support of leisure; a term which Labour has used interchangeably with the arts and culture. In one 1959 pamphlet, Labour is shown as encouraging patronage in the arts, to help develop a more cultured society. In this pamphlet, *Leisure for Living*, Labour states that "public support for the arts ought not to be an issue of party politics"—Labour remarking that their party has long supported public art initiatives, and that Conservative governments have dragged their feet when making any real change to support public art programs; instead wanting the enjoyment of art to remain a privilege of the elite and wealthy.[422] Whether this assessment of Labour

---

[419]LPA, NAD/FOL/1/5 "The Art Exhibition is in connection with the Labour Party Festival of the Arts", Michael Ayrton, June 1962.

[420] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/5 "The Art Exhibition is in connection with the Labour Party Festival of the Arts", Michael Ayrton, June 1962. The artwork that is being referred to is the screen-set façade of the Time-Life building in London, which remains in situ. The screen was listed as Grade II by Historic England on March 29, 1988; list number 1264063. More information on this piece, including its design and history, can be found at: https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1264063 .

[421] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/5 "The Art Exhibition is in connection with the Labour Party Festival of the Arts", Michael Ayrton, June 1962

[422] LPA, "Leisure for Living", The Labour Party, October 1959, 10.

views on art versus Conservative views on art is correct or exaggerated, the assertion that Labour is the only party to promote access to the arts is the key point to take from this. Here, Labour is suggesting that a more cultured, cosmopolitan society benefits all social classes with the suggestion that the development of the arts is one example in which Britain can achieve this cosmopolitan status but makes the claim as a sort of political attack on their opponents. This is further demonstrated when examining the types of exhibitions that were supported by the Festival of Labour, where we can see the development and promotion of the arts as being core to Labour's mandate that within a Welfare State, the intellectual and imaginative aspects of life also need to be provided for by the State.

Returning again to Crosland, he acknowledges that in the redistribution of wealth amongst the nation, the arts and culture would suffer severely, due to the arts long receiving patronage from the rich and wealthy. While the redistribution of wealth is necessary, Crosland feels that the State must then step in to provide an alternative method of patronage for the arts and culture; noting that wealthy patronage alone within the arts only creates further inequality.[423] Crosland argues that the State must not only support the arts, but initiate arts programs, citing the Festival of Britain as giving "more splendid openings to young architects than they had enjoyed for a long time past", and that the use of arts and artists within the Festival of Britain showed that "the State can even initiate, as opposed to merely supporting, artistic endeavor of the highest quality."[424] Some of the examples that Crosland gives as proof of a socialist approach to the arts being successful are government subsidies that support The Arts Council, Covent Garden, the British Museum, Britain's many art galleries, such as the National Gallery; and also, the Edinburgh Festival, much of Britain's serious theatre, and also National Trust properties and ancient monuments.[425] With this concept we can also understand clearly the heavy integration of the arts and art exhibitions within the Festival of Labour. Labour is demonstrating their commitment to the arts by not only providing financial support for museums and culture, but by also initiating high quality artistic endeavors.

The types of art exhibitions that were hosted within the Festival of Labour acknowledges the growing conversation within Labour on the importance of incorporating leisure and the arts within society. This is shown by the Festival of Labour's support for and

---

[423] Crosland, *Socialism*, 199-200.
[424] Crosland, *Socialism*, 201.
[425] Crosland, *Socialism*, 201.

the encouragement of the arts, which is again another concept we saw in CEMA and throughout the Festival of Britain. One of the exhibitions held was the "Children's Art Exhibition", working under the theme of "Our Street".[426] Submissions for this exhibition were open to all ages and divided into three separate age-based categories. While there is little, if any, that is documented on what the art looked like in this exhibition; organizers enthusiastically proclaimed, "Who knows, the London Labour Party might be the first to display a future Graham Sutherland!"[427] As an official wartime artist for the government, Sutherland crafted numerous drawings depicting the Blitz, and was commissioned by the newly rebuilt Coventry Cathedral and was well known for his role within Britain's artistic community. Due to this, the reference to discovering a "future Graham Sutherland" would have been a well-recognized metaphor connecting Labour with modern art and the newness that Labour would bring to Britain again. In the staging of this exhibition, we clearly see Labour's investment in the future by its encouragement of the arts in younger generations. Unfortunately, as no documentation remains on the children featured in the exhibition, we cannot identify if any future, well-known artists emerged from this display; but the point remains: the party was focused on alerting their public that Labour would and was prioritizing underrepresented sections of society, which furthered Labour's earlier cultural polices on the development of Britain's cultural milieu. Another feature was the Festival's "Modern Art Exhibition", which took an approach to modern art in a similar vein that the Welsh Committee employed in the 1960s: using modern art to present a new and contemporary version of the nation.

The "Modern Art Exhibition" was staged to last longer than the Festival's formal three days, occurring June 14-27th. The exhibition was hosted at the Trades Union Congress's Congress Hall in London, itself a modernist building, having only been completed in 1958. The intentional decision to host a modern art exhibition within a new, modernist building is reminiscent of the extreme effort to make the Festival of Britain look modern and futuristic. For the Festival of Britain, this was a marked contrast to the conditions in which many were living in. For the Festival of Labour, this was meant to signify that the Party was once again the political party of modernism, and much like Crosland's rhetoric that Labour needed to shift focus on its future, this signified that Labour only looked ahead. The subtleties of the Festival staging help to make the point that the Labour Party was looking towards the future.

---

[426] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/8. Festival of Labour/ London Labour Party Children's Art Exhibition 30th April 1962.
[427] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/8. Festival of Labour/ London Labour Party Children's Art Exhibition 30th April 1962.

Promotional material described the event as consisting of the "best available works by twenty or thirty of the most gifted and promising British artists of the day."[428] The number of artists chosen was intentional. It was felt that in choosing only 20 or 30 artists, the exhibition would be able to show more than one piece by each painter to indicate the artist's range. The term 'promising' was meant to suggest the young age range of the selected artists.[429] The notion of having a small number of artists, so that each could display multiple pieces of work, would allow for each artist to be more marketable. By showcasing their range, their opportunities for sales and commissions increased, which would have been a positive attribute of the exhibition, only proving Labour's support for arts as beneficial and again asserting that Labour's cultural polices would develop and promote the arts. Besides the Modern Art Exhibition and Children's Art Exhibition, one of the other features within the Festival of Labour was a global art presentation, to link Labour with a more global outlook.

One of the most important art exhibitions to be borne from the Festival of Labour was a presentation of artworks taken from around the world: the "Prints of the World" exhibition. Containing 200 works of graphic art from around the world, the "Prints of the World" exhibition was first of its kind to be shown in Britain. The contributing countries/ regions were: America, Australia, China, Eskimo Prints, Finland, France, Great Britain, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Thailand, and Vietnam.[430] The exhibition debuted at the South London Art Gallery in Camberwell, and was opened by Hugh Gaitskell, then leader of the Labour Party.[431] The promotional image for the exhibition, used in advertisements and as the cover for the program catalogue, was an image of a Mayan ceremonial procession in contrasting black, white, and red.[432] Unmistakably bold and taking its artistic inspiration from contemporary pop art, the advertisement for this exhibition would be one of the most-seen images from the Festival of Labour. "Prints of the World" became one of the most popular and successful events from the Festival, and later travelled across the UK. Following its display in London, "Prints of the World" travelled onwards to Leeds, Nottingham, Manchester, and Glasgow. [433] With each city hosting the exhibition for

---

[428] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/5, Festival of Labour promotional booklet. Unfortunately, there seems to be no surviving documentation listing which artists were involved in this exhibition. The promotional material also does not list any "headline grabbing" names.

[429] LPA, NAD/FOL/1/5, Festival of Labour promotional booklet.

[430] LPA, Festival of Labour, Box 7; NAD/FOL/4/5, "Prints of the World" Catalogue.

[431] LPA, Festival of Labour, Box 7; NAD/FOL/4/5

[432] LPA, Festival of Labour, Box 7; NAD/FOL/4/5, "Prints of the World" Catalogue.

[433] LPA, Festival of Labour, Box 7; NAD/FOL/4/5, "Prints of the World" Catalogue. The exhibition opened in Leeds on July 20th, Nottingham on August 31st, Manchester on October 15th, and Glasgow on November 16th.

approximately one month, this exhibition was both the longest lasting event from the Festival of Labour, and also widest reaching. While the catalogue lists the countries and tour dates, there are sadly no descriptions on the types of prints included in this exhibition. The significance behind the "Prints of the World" exhibition complemented the emergence of a cosmopolitan society in the 1960s. With a growing appreciation for foreign films and music, this exhibit connected to a growing rhetoric from Labour on the future of Britain relating to industry and internationalism. The role of the science and technology was complemented by the use of the arts and leisure, which helps give an understanding into how Labour was defining modernity and modern living in Britain.

Labour's plan to integrate the arts into everyday life gained momentum when Labour returned to Downing Street in 1964. Shortly after Harold Wilson took the reins from Alec Douglas-Home, he appointed Jennie Lee as the first Minister for the Arts. The Scottish Labour MP for Cannock, Lee was influential in granting government support and funding for the arts and heritage industry. The Festival was a demonstration of Labour's commitment to crafting a social-democratic society that provided for its peoples, and loosely compared Britain's use of the artist to her more modern European counterparts, arguing that only with proper patronage of the arts, could Britain achieve the cultural status that Labour felt was being enjoyed elsewhere in Europe and the United States. This meant having a culture that was shared and accessible to all, not just the elite few. This provides further evidence on political parties realizing the importance of the arts in facilitating government agendas, and comparisons to the role of CEMA in promoting, maintaining, and providing accessibility to the arts can be seen. We also can see how Labour, and likely the Conservative Party, were beginning to understand how their nation's cultural community fared when compared to Britain's counterparts.

The outcome of the Festival of Labour can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Through various avenues, including the Festival, Labour was able to demonstrate that they had enough political currency to persuade voters to return the Party to Downing Street, which was achieved at the next election in 1964. One of the major elements of The Festival of Labour was the view that culture and the arts was a political matter, but perhaps the emphasis on showcasing modern art ironically presented it in ways that made it seem elite and not open to everyone; the opposite of its intentions on demonstrating art under socialism/Labour as

---

With each city hosting the exhibition for approximately one month, this exhibition was the longest lasting event from the Festival of Labour; and the widest reaching.

being accessible and enjoyed by all. Yet in other ways, the Festival was consciously modern and appealing, such as the traditional tableaux and floats that were juxtaposed with content supporting a new Labour that included science, nuclear energy, and space travel.[434] While the aim of the Festival was to mark entrance to a new era of Labour politics, many of the art exhibitions were viewed by the public as being too modern and therefore out of reach, and attendance at the Festival's exhibitions was quite low. The exhibition on modern art at TUC's Congress Hall was sparsely attended, with many feeling the sculpture and paintings on display were "too advanced" for their liking.[435] However, despite a lack of public engagement with the art exhibitions supported by the Festival, many of the artists featured, including Henry More, Frank Auerbach, and Gillian Ayres, would go on to make an impact in the art scene. Many of those featured in these exhibitions would achieve great success, with numerous recognized in the Queen's Birthday Honours throughout their careers.[436] Lawrence Black, when writing on the Festival of Labour, commented that the Festival was more of a "moment, not a movement" in Labour's approach to culture; but that the Festival was a marked transition in Labour's cultural policy attitudes.[437]

Following Labour's return to power, the Wilson administration became the first to have a dedicated department focused on the arts, under the direction of Jenny Lee. Lee's Ministry of Arts provided support for and enabled wider access to existing forms of culture, with regional development and an understanding that free entry to museums was vital.[438]

[434]Lawrence Black, "The Festival of Labour, 1962." Labour Pains, November 15, 2016. http://www.labourpains.group.shef.ac.uk/the-festival-of-labour-1962/.

[435] Black, "The Festival of Labour, 1962."

[436] List of Artists and their selected works: <u>Oil Paintings:</u> **Frank Auerbach**, *Swings;* **Gillian Ayres**, *Spoor 1*, *Spoor II*, 1962; **Trevor Bell**, *Heightened Ochre; Black, White and Blue*, 1962; **Peter Blake**, *Elvis Presley Wall,* 1961; **Sandra Blow,** *Painting; Black, White, Brown*, 1961; **Derek Boshier**, *Epitaph to Somewhere Over the Rainbow; Megaloxenophobia*, 1962; **Pauline Boty**, *Gershwin, Painting,* 1962; **Frank Bowling**, *Paddy's Painting, From Painting 1961; Water People, From Painting 1961*, 1962; **John Bratby**, *Goodbye Summer*, 1960; *Blasted Windows,* 1950; **George Chapman**, *Up from the Pits;* **Harold Cohen**, *Beta Andromeda Summer*, 1961; **Terry Frost**, *January; Brown and Mars Yellow, 1961;* **Derrick Greaves**, *Fragmented Bouquet;* **Patrick Heron**, *Yellow Painting with Black Squares* 1959/60; *Squares on Dull Green*, 1960; **Roger Hilton**, *May; Brown: March*, 1961; **David Hockney**, *Boy with a portable mirror; Hero, Heroine and Villain; Study for we 2 boys together clinging;* **Gwyther Irwin**, *Four to the Bar; Privates Progress*, 1961; **Peter Lanyon**, *High Tide*, 1959; *Coast Wind*, 1957; **Henry Munday**, *Composition,* 1962; **Victor Pasmore**, *Wooden Painting in Red*, 1962; *Relief in Black, Brown and White;* **William Scott**, *White Blue Brown*, 1960; **Jon Thompson**, *That's the way for Billy and me; The Red Badge of Courage*, 1962; **Joe Tilson**, *Wood relief no. 20; wood relief no. 14*; 1961; **William Turnball**, *Painting TB 01; Painting No. 3;* 1961; **Michael Upton**, *Tomb; Corps ,*1962; **Bryan Wynter**, *River Daemon* 1960; *Golconda,* 1959. <u>Sculpture:</u> **Robert Adams, Kenneth Armitage, Ralph Brown, Lynn Chadwick, Elizabeth Frank, John Hoskin, F.E. McWilliam, ARA; Henry More, CH; Eduardo Paolozzi, Brian Wall, Austin Wright, William Turnbull**. LPA, Festival of Labour, Box 7; NAD/FOL/6/4, "New Art" booklet.

[437] Black, "Festival of Labour".

[438] Museums in the UK would not gain free entry until 2001, under the Blair administration; however, there were museums such as the Victoria and Albert Museum, National Gallery, and British Museum that had free

Within the Wilson administration, Lee also invested heavily in arts spending, which resulted in the flourishing pop culture we often associate with London in the 1960s, but also in the successes seen in the Welsh and Scottish Committees and Arts Council.[439]

Following the Festival of Labour in 1962, another government-sponsored arts festival emerged as a vehicle for promoting the Commonwealth. Trends of modernism continued to flow though this festival, occurring during a period of rapid decolonization, which allowed for festival organizers to curate an event focused on developing an Anglo-Commonwealth centric identity.

5.3: *Treasures of the Commonwealth* and the "Commonwealth Arts Festival", 1965

As mentioned earlier, the planning for the Festival of Britain commenced in the final years of the 1940s, with the Festival's planners seeking to create a spectacle of British innovation and influence around the world, making connections to her imperial legacy but more so focusing on Britain's future and her place in the world. The Festival of Britain not only celebrated the best of Britain and her influences across the globe, but also demonstrated the role of culture and technology in constructing both a new British-Commonwealth centric identity as well as setting new standards in design and good living, which sought to present a modern approach to Britain's post-war presence. The modernist designs unveiled at the Festival of Britain would set the trend for British aesthetics for the next decade. In the same way that Britain would use her position within the Commonwealth of Nations as a new and dynamic union in comparison to the United Nations and the European Economic Community, the Festival helped to signaled Britain's modernity and global position. Seeing Britain in the Commonwealth was another depiction of modernism: The Commonwealth itself is modernity due to being a progressive union that is based on free and equal cooperation.[440] This section will explore how the Commonwealth Arts Festival was used to shape British culture as being more connected to the Commonwealth, depicting Britain as a modern and global nation.

In September 1965, the United Kingdom played host for a festival celebrating the arts and cultural impact of the Commonwealth and their shared cultural identity. This is, in some

---

entry since the 19th Century. So, while limited, there was free access to heritage and the arts during the 1960s and 1970s. See:

"Universal Free Admission to the UK's National Museums." Centre for Public Impact (CPI). Accessed October 26, 2020. https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/case-study/free-entry-to-museums-in-the-uk/.

[439] Black, "Festival of Labour".

[440] "Our History." The Commonwealth, February 28, 2020. https://thecommonwealth.org/about-us/history.

ways, reminiscent of the Festival of Britain, due to the Commonwealth Arts Festival's focus on promoting the Commonwealth and Britain as modern and exciting. Various artists, writers and poets, musicians and dancers; all representing national cultures, came together to present and celebrate a multicultural Commonwealth.[441] Lasting from September 16th until October 2nd, the festival travelled from London to Liverpool, Cardiff, and Glasgow; and included arts and crafts exhibitions, literary readings, dance performances, and dramatic productions; and were all sponsored by their national governments.[442] The goal of Commonwealth Arts Festival was to showcase the multiculturalism within the Commonwealth, using a cultural policy to intersect arts and culture with society, strengthening a new Anglo-Commonwealth identity post-decolonization and reasserting the emphasis on Britain and the Commonwealth being new and modern.

Originally under the working title of "The British Commonwealth at Home", the festival was designed "to bring together far flung lands, connected by the legacy of empire, to establish goodwill through culture and the arts."[443] During the planning process, the Director-General of the Commonwealth Arts Festival Society, Ian Hunter, travelled extensively throughout the Commonwealth and engaged in hundreds of cultural events, to better understand the cultural connections the Commonwealth has to offer, and how to best include them in the three-week festival.[444] Hunter explained that "the first Commonwealth Arts Festival to be held in London next year is aimed at revealing the importance and diversity of the cultural traditions which exist in the Commonwealth countries".[445] Hunter expanded upon this by saying the arts festival was aimed at forging an artistic link between the Commonwealth; as the Commonwealth was currently linked through "trade, sport, science, medicine, education and in spirit", but with no link "in the field of the arts."[446] Following Hunter's successful Commonwealth tour, all members of the Commonwealth were invited to participate in the event, and ultimately, the majority of the Commonwealth did

---

[441] Radhika Natarajan, "Performing Multiculturalism: The Commonwealth Arts Festival of 1965." *Journal of British Studies* 53, no. 3 (July 2014): 705–33. Accessed February 10. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2014.104, 705.

[442]TNA DO 163/105

[443] Low, "At Home?", 98.

[444]TNA DO 163/105. This file, part of a larger set of documents relating to the Commonwealth Arts Festival, contains correspondences between Ian Hunter and numerous government officials about his upcoming Commonwealth tour. Along with travel expenses and accommodation arrangements, there are also Hunter's incredibly detailed notes recapping each day of his multi-national trip, which lasted a few months.

[445] TNA DO 163/106. This quote it taken from an article by *The Daily Mirror*, which interviewed Hunter, and is dated 14/11/1964.

[446] TNA DO 163/106

engage in some form.[447] The Minster for the Arts, Jennie Lee, commented that "This Festival is a unique event, and the response from other Commonwealth Governments has shown how important it is that it should succeed."[448] The costs for the Festival were met by each nation participating, with the British costs covered by the Commonwealth Arts Festival Society.[449] Given the enthusiastic support from the British government and Commonwealth governments, there was hope that this event would turn into a regular series, occurring bi-annually, and hosted by various Commonwealth nations.

The arts festival contained a variety of cultural and artistic displays, performances, and exhibitions. The theme of the Festival was described as "one of contrast"—allowing for each Commonwealth nation to present their own version and expression of arts and entertainment.[450] Outside of Trafalgar Square, a large stage was erected to allow for free lunchtime musical and dance performances, which allowed for more public engagement and hoped to capture a wider audience. These performances included steel drum bands and traditional dances and was considered necessary to add "gaiety and interest" to the Festival.[451] Royal Albert Hall was the setting for the *"Great Dance Gala"*, which included performances by groups from Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and South Pacific; and was attended by The Duke of Edinburgh; who also was the Chairman of the Advisory Council. Symphony orchestras from Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom performed at Royal Festival Hall, with some evenings being devoted to jazz and light music and individual programs from Commonwealth artists.[452] The largest art exhibition was hosted by the Royal

---

[447] TNA DO 163/106, Programme of Events for the Commonwealth Arts Festival. The countries participating were: Australia, Canada, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Ghana, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, and Zambia.

[448] TNA DO 163/107, letter from Jennie Lee to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, James Callaghan.

[449] TNA DO 163/105. Her Majesty's Government contributed £80,000 to cover the cost of the Festival, and substantial subsidies were provided for the cities holding events. Commonwealth governments were expected to pay the costs for their exhibits, travel and accommodation fares for their performers, and any other cost that was incurred on behalf of the Festival. Aside from Rhodesia, who did have some financial difficulties; there was no disagreement from Commonwealth governments on this arrangement. Found in DO 163/107 is the correspondence from James Callaghan stating that "A majority of Commonwealth governments have now agreed to participate on the basis that they will pay the cost of getting artists and their equivalent to Britain, the costs in this country [Britain] being met by the Society".

[450] TNA DO 105/107, The Commonwealth Arts Festival official documents.

[451] TNA WORK 25/340 "Trafalgar Square". There was some controversy over there being a stage on Trafalgar Square. As this was before the Square was pedestrianised, there were fears over congestion; as well as the dress of the dancers. An article was published in various press outlets that showed photographs of traditional female dancers topless, and concerns were raised over the appropriateness of these dancers. Eventually, it was agreed that the dancers would all remain fully clothed; and the stage was given the go ahead.

[452] TNA DO 163/107

Academy and featured almost exclusively loans given by The Queen from The Royal Collection. Entitled *Treasures of the Commonwealth*, this exhibition was the last major Commonwealth-centric exhibition to be held following *Australian Painting* and *Canadian Painting, 1939-1963*, held earlier in the decade. There was also an exhibition entitled *Children's Art from the Commonwealth*, which took place at the Royal College of Art. On the lesser end of the artistic spectrum was a Commonwealth film showing and fireworks display on the Thames.[453] In Liverpool, the theme of "From the Port of Liverpool to every Commonwealth country" focused on the daily links with the Commonwealth that connected Liverpool to her Commonwealth neighbors. Aside from a military tattoo, Liverpool also engaged with their entertainment links to the Commonwealth, and including African beat groups, and Australian and Canadian ballet; as well as guest Commonwealth artists taking the stage across Lancashire music-halls.[454]

Outside of England, Cardiff played a major role in promoting Commonwealth and Welsh culture. Cardiff, like London, hosted art exhibitions and dance performances; as well as a "celebration of the new and the traditional in the arts of Wales"; and a conference promoting the "Young Commonwealth Poets '65'". Promotional material represented Cardiff as "a city of festivities", where "the richness of the Commonwealth amid the hospitality and beauty of Wales" would be accessible and enjoyed by all.[455] Glasgow, whose theme was "The Clyde—Gateway to the Commonwealth" again was unified in her art displays and dance performances, and hosted their own *Great Dance Gala*, but featured more on musical links with the Commonwealth. Their performances included jazz concerts, traditional Scottish piping and dancing and a special Commonwealth Ceilidh, and hosted Commonwealth symphony orchestras. One of their largest events was the BBC Scottish Orchestra performing Commonwealth music.[456]

While there is documentation on the types of events hosted by the Commonwealth Arts Festival, there is little note of the individual pieces of artwork and sculpture displayed, or the specific dances that were performed.[457] Pathe newsreels of the Festival is generally

---

[453] TNA DO 163/106, Programme of Events for the Commonwealth Arts Festival.
[454] TNA DO 163/106, Programme of Events for the Commonwealth Arts Festival.
[455] TNA DO 163/106, Programme of Events for the Commonwealth Arts Festival.
[456] TNA DO 163/106, Programme of Events for the Commonwealth Arts Festival.
[457] The most detailed notes on the specific content within the Commonwealth Arts Festival is found in file DO 163/107. In a list of festival notes dated February 23, 1965, taken during a meeting a Marlborough House, the participating Commonwealth countries are listed, along with their cultural contributions. Some of the notes

broad, with few close ups on sculptures or artworks; but the musical and dance elements are generally shown to a narrator speaking over them; so, we are unable to fully enjoy or listen to the Festival. With that knowledge, the Festival does give us some invaluable insight into the thought process around culture, identity, and Britain. Prior to this festival, the newly opened Commonwealth Institute provided exhibition spaces for Commonwealth countries to display their art and heritage (for many, this was the only venue in London where Commonwealth artists could have personal exhibits), but also gave Commonwealth members the space to market themselves following decolonization as an independent and vibrant country.[458] The necessity to showcase their cultural heritage, and links to Britain, outside of the Institute demonstrates the understanding of the importance of securing an Anglo-Commonwealth identity, which would promote Britain as being modern and new and relevant, similar to how the Festival of Britain used modernist art and architecture to create a sense of optimism in the future. Just as Britain would align themselves with Europe in constructing a new British-European identity in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Commonwealth Arts Festival and the Royal Academy's *"Treasures of the Commonwealth"* provided Commonwealth cultural links to identity. This three-week multi-city festival provided discourse on a possible British-Commonwealth identity, during a period of political uncertainty towards Britain's economic future. The 1965 Commonwealth exhibition was hosted in-between Britain's first two failed attempts at joining the EEC. The Commonwealth Arts Festival can be considered an inwards-directed attempt to remake British identity as one connected with the Commonwealth; replacing an imperial identity with a new, cultural Commonwealth based identity. In this sense, the culture of the Commonwealth was mobilized to construct the idea that both British and Commonwealth citizens could see themselves as part of the same cultural identity; using cultural diplomacy to signal to Commonwealth governments that Britain was looking to keep their diplomatic links close together. Of course, the Commonwealth Arts Festival was a one-time event, and as Britain's politicians would turn more towards Europe, her Commonwealth partners would be placed on the backburner. The 1965 Arts Festival was a one-off attempt at showcasing a new Anglo-Commonwealth identity, which ultimately would fail to gain traction in the arts fields. It is important to note that the bi-annual Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) is considered one of the more important meetings of

---

are specific, such as Hong Kong's "unicorn dance" and Kenya's "16 Embu dancers"; but others are less specific, such as Malaysia's "contemporary art exhibition" and Uganda's "important group of dancers".

[458] Ruth Craggs, "The Commonwealth Institute and the Commonwealth Arts Festival: Architecture, Performance and Multiculturalism in Late-Imperial London." *The London Journal* 36, no. 3 (2011): 247–68. https://doi.org/10.1179/174963211x13127325480352, 257.

Commonwealth politicians, and while major political decisions are made, artistic elements are rarely featured. Ian Hunter had hoped that the Commonwealth Arts Festival would travel with the CHOGM meetings, keeping the artistic link alive.

Following the Commonwealth Arts Festival, another government-sponsored cultural festival occurred in the following decade, to celebrate Britain's membership to the European Community. This event, the Fanfare for Europe, built upon ideas presented within the Commonwealth Arts Festival on integrating cultures to show a wider, broader and more global British culture. However, unlike the Commonwealth Arts Festival, the Fanfare for Europe focused solely on merging British and European art and culture, demonstrating cultural policies that aligned well with Britain's political turn towards Europe.

5.4: "Fanfare for Europe", 1973

The Fanfare for Europe was a two-week long festival of culture, featuring numerous events across Britain, with most of the events occurring in the capital. These events included theatrical performances, sporting events, thanksgiving services, and art exhibitions; and were attended by The Queen, Prime Minister Heath, and other senior members of the Royal Family and Government.[459] With over 500 events planned at the cost of £350,000, the Fanfare for Europe was meant to showcase British and European culture and their new union, but unlike 1951's Festival of Britain, it would ultimately prove unpopular.[460] This section discusses the ways in which art and culture were used to present a new, Anglo-European identity, further showing a period in which government priorities and the arts seemed to align.

Debuting on January 3, 1973, the Fanfare for Europe was launched by The Queen and Prime Minister Edward Heath—who had successfully negotiated Britain's entry into the European Economic Community—attending a gala opening at the Royal Opera House in Covent Garden. For sporting spectators, a match at Wembley described as "The Six versus. The Three" pitted the original six members of the EEC versus the newest three members; and debuted at the same time as the Gala performance.[461] The Fanfare offered something for all interests and tastes. There were theatrical performances by Sir Laurence Olivier, Judi Dench, and Dame Sybil Thorndike; a vintage car rally, poetry readings from the leading poets of the

---

[459] Robert Saunders, *Yes to Europe!* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 6.
[460] "Starting Today—The Great Euro Show", *Daily Mirror*, 3 January 1973.
[461] "Starting Today—The Great Euro Show", *Daily Mirror*, 3 January 1973. The Wembley Match featured players from all nine members of the EEC, with the players from the original six nations against players from Denmark, Ireland, and Britain.

Common Market, and musical performances by the Danish Radio Symphony Orchestra, The Chieftains and their traditional Irish folk music, the Berlin Philharmonic under the celebrated Herbert von Karajan, and the Welsh National Opera.[462] This wide range of events was meant to bring together the very best of the member nations within the European Community, showcasing a union of culture and a new shared cultural identity. Essentially, a message of within the Community, you have access to the best of everything. This sentiment is echoed in a message from the Prime Minister, published on January 1, 1973 in the *London Illustrated News*. Heath remarks that membership to the EEC is not just about joining a common market, but also about sharing economic and social issues, using the "outward looking Community" to break down "barriers between North and South, rich and poor, and the wider world"; and that membership will provide new challenges and new opportunities to prosper.[463] Heath followed this up by saying "Britain has much to contribute to, as well as much to gain from, the new Europe which is being created. We can look forward with excitement to the venture on which we are embarking."[464] Heath may have viewed the Fanfare for Europe as celebration of good politics, but the Government used the arts and their cultural policies to promote the new Anglo-European partnership.

Looking closer at some of the events that were promoted within the heritage industry, we can see the emphasis put on sharing culture and an artistic community. Under the scheme of a Festival for European Art, treasures were gathered from across Europe.[465] In the years leading up to Britain's membership of the European Community, there were some considerable loans of British art and sculpture to galleries across Europe, and numerous exhibitions in London featured artists from either within the European Community or from countries that would become members.[466] This provided a foundation for art exhibitions curated specifically for the Fanfare for Europe. Some of the exhibitions featured in the Festival for European Art were "Treasures from the European Community", held at the Victoria and Albert Museum; "The Impressionists in London", an exhibition of German-Swiss artist Dieter Roth, and "Staging the Romans", all held at the Hayward Gallery at Southbank. The Fanfare was not exclusive to London, however. Echoing the earlier Festival

---

[462] "Fanfare for Europe: Programme of Events, January 3-13", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.
[463] "Fanfare for Europe: Message from the Prime Minister", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.
[464] "Fanfare for Europe: Message from the Prime Minister", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.
[465] Saunders, *Yes to Europe!*, 6.
[466] These exhibitions contribute to the main discussion within chapter six and will be discussed fully there.

of Britain and Commonwealth Arts Festival, events were staged across the United Kingdom, including Birmingham and various locations in Scotland.

Under the direction of its patron, former Conservative Prime Minister Alec Douglas-Home, the Scottish Fanfare for Europe Committee planned events in most major Scottish cities, with the majority taking place in Edinburgh. Initially, the committee advised against hosting Scotland's Fanfare events in January, citing poor weather and atmosphere; instead requesting a year-long celebration in Scotland. In a letter sent to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), the committee remarked

"…the first fortnight in January is about the worst possible time in the entire year for <u>celebrations or manifestations of this kind in Scotland</u>. After the usual Christmas and New Year festivities life tends to be at a rather low ebb at this time!" [467]

Heath was adamant, however, that all Fanfare celebrations were to occur simultaneously in the beginning weeks of January, marking entry into the Community as a massive celebration; and the FCO responded with a similar tone: "…your point about the weather and Hogmanay hangovers [is understood] but the Prime Minister's intentions are very clear on this point. The Fanfare celebrations must take place during the first fortnight in January."[468] The committee was given a budget of £7500 (from a total allocation for Fanfare events of approximately £100,000) and planning commenced.[469] The Program of Events included an exhibition sponsored by the EEC Consulate held at Edinburgh University, film and television specials featuring EEC films, continental cookery demonstrations, and various sporting events. The largest of the events scheduled was a television spectacular at Stirling Castle featuring folk and light music, Baroque chamber concerts held in Dundee, Inverness, and Aberdeen; and a banquet held by the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, which included sophisticated Scottish foods given in honor of visiting presidents and officials.[470] Press commentary of Scotland's Fanfare for Europe appear to be largely indifferent, or non-existent, suggesting that little attention was paid to events happening outside of London. Earlier press reports in 1971 and 1972 had been a mixture of European membership being positive or negative of Scotland, but with more articles promoting Scotland's benefits of membership within the Common Market.

---

[467]TNA, FCO 13/529, letter to Anthony Royal at the Foreign and Commonwealth office dated 27 June 1972.
[468] TNA, FCO 13/529, letter from FCO.
[469] TNA, FCO 13/529
[470] TNA, FCO 13/529, "Programme of Events"

The most substantial loan that (almost) occurred in the early Seventies was loans between the Louvre and the British Museum. As part of the Fanfare for Europe celebrations, the British Museum was meant to loan the Rosetta Stone to the Louvre. In return, the French government loaned the British Museum the de La Tour painting "Le Tricheur de l'As de Carreau" (The Card Sharp with the Ace of Diamonds). The two works were roughly comparable in value, each around an estimated £1 million in 1972.[471] This loan is substantial for a variety of reasons. The de La Tour painting had only recently been acquired by the Louvre in 1972 and is considered to be a masterpiece of French painting, and specifically Georges de La Tour. The Rosetta Stone, dating to 192 BC and after its discovery in 1799, has almost continuously been on display at the British Museum since 1802. Easily one of the more recognizable assets of the British Museum, the Rosetta Stone also shares a French connection: having been discovered by French army officer Pierre Francois Xavier Bouchard during a French military campaign in Egypt; the loaning of this piece to the Louvre would have symbolized the long cultural history between France and Britain. Yet, despite interventions from the Prime Minister, the Rosetta Stone stayed firmly in London. This would most likely be because the Stone had been loaned to the Louvre in October 1972 as a month-long exhibition; and as the most important Egyptian artefact in the collection, the British Museum was apprehensive about loaning the object out.[472] The de La Tour painting was loaned to the British Museum, yet it is unclear if the British Museum made any loans to the Louvre. This disappointment in Fanfare events was not unique. Numerous attempts and grand celebrations were made, with more than one failing to come to fruition, particularly those with Anglo-French connections.

The importance of the relationship between France and Britain in the early Seventies was underlined by their most important public cultural instructions loaning some of their highest valued objects. However, the reluctance to exchange the Mona Lisa and the Rosetta Stone between the Louvre and British Museum also demonstrates a lower level of skepticism between the two nations. In a sense of irony, the failure to make these two major loans foreshadows the Fanfare as a whole; failing to deliver its intended goal of celebrating a union of shared culture. Prior to the Fanfare, government officials in the early Seventies assumed a positive response would come from a festival similar to 1951's Festival of Britain.

---

[471] TNA, FCO 13/530, "Rosetta Stone: Loan to the Louvre"
[472] "Review: The Rosetta Stone by Robert Sole and Dominique Valbelle," The Guardian (Guardian News and Media, September 22, 2001), https://www.theguardian.com/books/2001/sep/22/historybooks.highereducation1.

Government officials reported in 1971 that "We believe there is a case for an exhibition whose purpose is primarily to educate the British public about the nature of the Community rather than to sell British goods", and that an exhibition demonstrating this should successfully be held in 1973, 74, or 75.[473] This was furthered with the statement:

> "We believe that there are strong psychological as well as practical reasons for organizing the main part of the exhibition around themes rather than national pavilions. This might be more difficult to organize but would bring home to public opinion the fact we have joined a Community with common interests and problems, and not simply a group of competing nations."[474]

Given these statements, one can see why the government would embrace a festival celebrating membership to a community that took three attempts to join. Yet a less than positive public response was not due to poor planning. When government planning officially began in 1972, the road to the Festival was filled with numerous bumps and hurdles to overcome along the way. Early in the planning stages, then-Minister of State for Aerospace and Shipping Michael Heseltine proposed using the soon-to-be completed Concord to fly French dignitaries to London for the celebrations.[475] Wales declined invitations to participate in "The Six" rugby match, citing its interference with the widely popular Six Nations matches and instead suggested focusing on Wales's theatre and opera communities, where Wales felt their better contribution "could be made within the field of artistic events", which also echoes Wales' emphasis on modern arts, as discussed earlier. [476] Another setback to grand plans occurred in July 1972 when the Foreign and Commonwealth Office advised against inviting European royalty to accompany the Queen to major events feeling it would be too political a statement amid comments that "elder French statemen would not be pleased if precedence was given to minor European royals".[477] *The Daily Express* remarked "Fanfare for Europe? Never! Gag for Europe is more likely. Not a blare of triumph. But a groan of stifled protest" when commenting on the upcoming Festival in October 1972.[478] Finally, in January 1973, it was confirmed the Concorde would not be used at all during the celebrations, leaving the

---

[473] TNA, FCO 26/1111 "Exhibition to be held in 1973, 74, 75" Confidential, undated letter.
[474] TNA, FCO 26/1111
[475] TNA, FCO 13/510, letter from Michael Heseltine, Minister of State for Aerospace and Shipping, 18 May 1972.
[476] TNA, FCO 13/510, letter from Letter from Welsh Office (J.W.M. Siberry) to John Morgan, Cultural Relations Department, 25 May 1972
[477] TNA, FCO 13/510, letter dated 24 July 1972.
[478] TNA, FCO 13/510, *Daily Express*, 10 October 1972.

government's cultural relations department to remark poignantly "so it all ends not with a boom but a whimper".[479] With the benefit of hindsight, this statement alludes to the complex and tense relationship between French and British diplomats in the Sixties and Seventies.

The statement of the celebrations ending with a whimper also reflected the overall public attitudes towards the Fanfare itself. Many of the events were sparsely attended: exhibitions never reached capacity, the great Wembley match reached half attendance, and the Queen arrived to the Covent Garden opening gala to a barrage of boos and complaints.[480] Public opinion viewed the government as misspending taxpayer's money, and the general attitude towards the Community soured.[481] However, it cannot be said that the lackluster Fanfare for Europe was the cause of general resentment. No matter how hard Heath's administration had used cultural diplomacy to present Britons as Europeans who were committed to the European project, Britain itself did not seem fully vested in the concept. As Andy Beckett points out in *When the Lights Went Out*, blaming Brussels and European membership for anything negative soon "became one of the most entrenched British political habits".[482] The failure of the Fanfare to spark interest in the Common Market reflected views on membership as a whole, including the lead up to the 1975 referendum to remain members of the European Community, as well as a failure in cultural policies. In this example, the use of a cultural policy in the form of a cultural festival to promote government aspirations failed to take off and provide any inspiration.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the use of cultural festivals to promote government ideals and aspirations. When discussing the use of cultural policies and how they seemed to align with government priorities, the festivals explored in this chapter all provide examples of government involvement with the arts. These festivals were all sponsored by government or political parties under a theme of modernism and Britain's future progress or influence. This is the unifying concept of these festivals. The Festival of Britain looked at science, design, and innovation under the Labour government as taking Britain into the future. The Festival of Labour's efforts to engage with and reenergize the Labour Party looked towards science and

---

[479] TNA, FCO 13/510, Letter from John Morgan, Cultural Relations Department, dated 11 January 1973.
[480] Andy Beckett, *When the Lights Went Out: What Really Happened to Britain in the Seventies*. (London: Faber and Faber, ltd, 2009), 94.
[481] Saunders, *Yes! To Europe*, 7.
[482] Beckett, *When the Lights Went Out*, 95.

innovation, and the arts and leisure, as the ways Labour with achieve a more egalitarian society. Both the Commonwealth Arts Festival and the Fanfare for Europe used art and culture to promote new identities and realms of influence: an Anglo-Commonwealth identity during decolonization and a focus on the Commonwealth, and an Anglo-European cultural identity following British membership with the European Community.

Outside of festivals, art exhibitions and galleries were also used to promote cultural policies that, at times, aligned with government priorities. This is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter Six: Exhibitions and Art Galleries

Introduction

This chapter will further this thesis's discussion of cultural policies and periods when the arts aligned with government priorities by discussing art exhibitions during the 1960s and 1970s that reflected, or responded to, politics. These exhibitions on Commonwealth and European art build upon earlier discussions relating to the Commonwealth Arts Festival and the Fanfare for Europe.

6.1: The Commonwealth: Art, Exhibitions, and London

As discussed previously, the loss of Empire and the emergence of the Commonwealth greatly altered how British governments saw themselves in the world, and their position of influence shifted from an imperial force to that of an integral member of the Commonwealth. Britain's cultural polices in the early 1960s reflect this transition and provides numerous examples of using the Commonwealth to show Britain's modernity. These exhibitions asserted seeing Britain in the Commonwealth as a form of modernity: like the UN and the EEC, the Commonwealth itself is modernity, and therefore, Britain was modern, too.

The Sixties brought in a wave of new art and culture. The traditional exhibitions of Turner, Gainsborough, and European art were still relevant, but as a new generation matured that was in-touch and held access to a global culture, exhibitions that featured artists from the Commonwealth made a few guest appearances. Yet, these exhibitions focused primarily on the "old dominions" of the Commonwealth: Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and less so on members of the Commonwealth that had recently gained independence and joined as a sovereign nation. These exhibitions occurred in the period when Britain was making her first application towards membership in the European Community, and their pointed to a tension within British political thought. While many of Britain's political leaders had not openly begun to look towards Europe for as a vehicle for increased political influence—viewing Europe as modern, instead of the old world—Britain's links to the Commonwealth and the important position the Commonwealth held in post-war British identity necessitate the need for a cultural policy that celebrated and promoted Britain's Commonwealth links. Two exhibitions held by the Tate Gallery in London in 1963 and 1964 provides evidence of a cultural policy using modern art to celebrate Britain's artistic links to the Commonwealth.

Between 1963 and 1964, the Tate Gallery, London hosted two exhibitions relating to Commonwealth Art. The first, 1963's *Australian Painting: Colonial, Impressionist, Contemporary*, had previously been shown in Australia and would be sent to the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa following its viewing in London. *Australian Painting* had been arranged by the Commonwealth Art Advisory Board and was on display from January 24-March 3, 1963.[483] The second exhibition, *Canadian Painting, 1939-1963*, was organized by the National Gallery of Canada, and was displayed from February 7-March 22, 1964.[484] The staging of these two exhibitions timed well with the reopening of the Commonwealth Institute in 1962.

The Commonwealth Institute replaced an older organization, the extravagant Nineteenth Century Imperial Institute.[485] The new Commonwealth Institute was opened by The Queen on November 6, 1962; nearly 70 years after her great-great-grandmother Queen Victoria had opened the Imperial Institute. In her opening speech, Queen Elizabeth noted that the Imperial Institute had been opened by the 'Queen-Empress' but the Commonwealth Institute by the 'Head of the Commonwealth'. She further commented that ''Empire has been transformed into a Commonwealth of equal and independent nations.''[486] Significantly, the Queen then went on to add that the Commonwealth is ''an association of peoples as well as governments...It is the thread of personal concern and understanding between individual people that weaves the strong fabric of the modern Commonwealth''.[487] This acknowledgement by the Queen of the transition from Empire to Commonwealth, and the role of the Head of State in opening an institution that marked their era, is remarkable. While the reopening of the Commonwealth Institute can be viewed as a facelift on an institution that celebrated Empire and colonial acquisitions, the Commonwealth Institute instead focused on newly independent nations, united in their shared culture. But the Commonwealth Institute also noted the individual contributions and unique heritage of each of its members, and invited others to partake in it. This link with Britain's imperial past had been acknowledged, but the transformation had been as well. The Commonwealth Institute and its mission to celebrate the achievements of the Commonwealth and her members saw an immediate increase in interest and activity. As attendance numbers grew rapidly, newly independent

---

[483] Tate Gallery Catalog, page 9.
[484] Tate Gallery Catalog, page 10.
[485] James Porter, "Empire to Commonwealth—a Cultural Dimension." *The Round Table* 96, no. 391 (August 2007): 435-46. Accessed March 19, 2019. doi:10.1080/00358530701565347. 435.
[486] Porter, "Empire to Commonwealth—a Cultural Dimension", 439.
[487] Porter, "Empire to Commonwealth—a Cultural Dimension", 439.

governments sought to finance engaging and original exhibitions. It is important to note that each Commonwealth member was responsible for financing their exhibitions and providing access to resources. As education programs began to expand and flourish, the art galleries provided new global opportunities, many for the first time, for artists located within the Commonwealth's realm.[488] The Institute was not just transitioning into a center for Commonwealth countries to celebrate their independence, it was also a place to learn about their history and struggles against colonialism. In addition, Commonwealth governments also sought to take advantage of a London location to promote their products and trade, a potential in tourism, and assert themselves as members of the international community.[489]

Returning to the two exhibitions held at the Tate Gallery, *Australian Painting* and *Canadian Painting*, why did the exhibitions choose to focus on the older Commonwealth ties, and not the newly joined members of the Commonwealth? Was it to reassure the longevity of the Commonwealth or its global presence, or simply because these countries had been tied to the Empire and had integrated into British society and culture already? One can argue that it is a mixture of both of these statements, that formed the rationale behind focusing on art from Australia and Canada, Britain's oldest dominions. The first exhibition on Australian Painting focused on a wide range of artistic methods, all taking inspiration from Australian landscapes and themes. British audiences viewed the Australian pieces featured in the exhibition favorably, stating that

> "…their value lies in the insight they give into English attitudes towards a nationalist, Australian cultural enterprise…Hence, most of the critics drew upon a series of well-worn stereotypes concerning the exotic nature of Australia's art or its progress as a nation."[490]

The Daily Telegraph declared that "Australia has produced more worthwhile painting than any of the other overseas territories of the Commonwealth." Similarly, *The Times* noted that Australian Painting was "a remarkable instance of Commonwealth development."[491] The popularity of the Australian exhibition was even commented upon when the Queen and Duke of Edinburgh visited Canberra for their jubilee celebrations in 1963. During a tour of

---

[488] Porter, "Empire to Commonwealth—a Cultural Dimension", 439-440.

[489] Porter, "Empire to Commonwealth—a Cultural Dimension", 440.

[490] Sarah Scott, "Art, Cold War Diplomacy and Commonwealth: Australian and Canadian Art at the Tate Gallery 1962–1964." *Journal of Australian Studies* 41, no. 4 (2017): 487-502. Accessed March 15, 2019. doi:10.1080/14443058.2017.1382552. 492.

[491] Scott, "Art, Cold War Diplomacy and Commonwealth", 492.

Australia's National Gallery, the Queen impressed her hosts by recognizing works by Australian artists, whom she said she had seen during the *Australian Painting* exhibition the month previously.[492] While the Australian exhibition was viewed in a positive light, the same cannot be said entirely for the Canadian exhibition, which is interesting, given the promotion of Canadian arts during this era.

  Canadian Painting, 1939-1963 went on exhibition at the Tate shortly after the closure of *Australian Painting*. The efforts of the Canadian exhibition can be traced back largely to Vincent Massey and Canadian Prime Minister Louis St-Laurent. Whereas the arts in Australia in the 1960s were poorly funded, the arts in Canada received ample governmental support and funding. In Australia, prior to the establishment of the Australia Council for the Arts (ACA) in 1967, government funding for the arts was only when deemed necessary.[493] It is worth noting, however, that during 1968-69, funding from the federal government for the arts was at 40%, and by 1988, this figure had risen to 51%; showing that after the establishment of the ACA, an increase in artistic support was evident.[494] Canadian art, on the other hand, had been actively supported since 1949 by the federal government. The Massey Commission, formally entitled the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, was enacted on April 8,1949 by Prime Minister Louis St-Laurent. The Commission was chaired by Vincent Massey, and its landmark report, the Massey Report, was published on June 1, 1951. After investigating the state of arts and culture in Canada, the Massey Commission advocated for the federal funding of a wide range of cultural activities and made a series of important recommendations that led to the founding of the National Library of Canada in 1953, the establishment of the Canada Council for the Arts in 1957, as well as federal aid for universities, actions towards conservation of Canada's historic places, and many other initiatives.[495]

---

[492] "200,000 Watch Queen's Drive", *Coventry Evening Standard*, 20 February 1963.

[493] Kate MacNeill, Lauren Lye, and Paul Caulfield, "Politics, Reviews and Support for the Arts: An Analysis of Government Expenditures on the Arts in Australia from 1967 to 2009." *Australian Review of Public Affairs* 12, no. 1 (August 2013): 1-19. Accessed June 26, 2019, 3.

[494] MacNeill, "Politics, Reviews and Support for the Arts", 3.

[495] For comparison purposes, the transition from CEMA to the Arts Council 1946, established to promote artistic endeavors and cultural preservation in the United Kingdom, and was later spilt into separate national bodies in the early 1990s.[495] With the appointment of Jennie Lee as Minister for the Arts in 1964, she supported the development of London's South Bank art centers. Another British entity, the British Council, supports a wider, global artistic presence and promotes British culture, and was established in 1934.
J.D.M Stewart and Helmut Kallmann, "Massey Commission". In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica Canada. Article published February 07, 2006; Last Edited September 21, 2016.
https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/massey-commission-emc

By looking at the exhibition catalogues from the Tate Gallery during the Sixties and Seventies, these two exhibitions are the only ones that predominately feature Commonwealth artists. The Royal Academy held no exhibitions that featured Commonwealth artists, but continuously held exhibitions that featured art and from Europe, the Americas, and Britain. It seems that the two exhibitions from Canada and Australia are unique, and it is likely no coincidence that their staging were so close in proximity. This is down to a few factors. The first being that both of these exhibitions were "travelling" exhibits, and given the relationship between Britain, Australia, and Canada, it makes sense for these exhibits to be shown in London. The showings of these exhibitions also coincides conveniently with the reopening of the Commonwealth Institute and a focus on the shift to Commonwealth membership following colonial independence. But we must also ask, why there were no other Commonwealth based exhibitions following 1965?[496] One can argue that the reason Commonwealth exhibitions ended was the political climate of the era. Following Macmillan's failed application to join the EEC in 1963, Britain turned their attention towards their European connections. Following the two exhibitions on Australian and Canadian art, the final Commonwealth-based exhibition was held in September 1965, the previously discussed The Commonwealth Arts Festival, and the *Treasures of the Commonwealth*, providing further evidence of cultural policies seeming to align with government's political priorities.

The political decision to transition Britain from a more Anglo-Commonwealth focus towards that of an Anglo-European one also affected cultural policies in the 1960s. While the cultural policies of the early 1960s still demonstrated a slight emphasis on the Commonwealth and its art and culture, it was after Britain's first application to join the EEC was rejected in 1963 that major British cultural institutions began to show greater interest in European arts and artists.

6.2: British Exhibitions of European Art

Towards the mid-Sixties, exhibitions that featured European artists—specifically artists from countries included in the Common Market—gained momentum. This could be for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the politics 1950s and early 1960s focused heavily on the impact of the loss of empire and the growth of the Commonwealth, and cultural policies

---

[496] There was one lone exhibition featuring an Australian artist, Sidney Nolan, in 1972. His exhibition of four pieces ran from November 25- December 24, 1972. Tate Gallery Catalog, 12.

reflected this. In response to this the period of 1950-1965 saw the emergence of Commonwealth literature exploring themes of colonization and its impact on indigenous cultures. The cultural policies in this period reflected Britain's transition from Empire to Commonwealth and four large Commonwealth-based art exhibitions and festivals occurred.[497] This was all due to cultural policies that wanted to depict Britain as being both forward-progressing and contemporary, and saw the Commonwealth as a form of modernity, much like the UN and the growing EEC. Britain's traditional imperial influence that spanned the politics of the Georgians through Victoria and George VI had been chipped away at over the course of the twentieth century. Post-1945, Britain's political influence was challenged by the wealth and subsequent influence of the United States, the birth of progressive entities like the UN, and the power behind the economically uniting European Community. Britain attempted to maintain its imperial influence under the guise of the Commonwealth, but as the Sixties progressed, both Conservative and Labour governments began to view European membership as the mechanism for global influence.

This brings us to the second reason why art exhibitions from Europe and the Common Market were displayed. There was a shift in rhetoric in seeing Europe as modern and new and not the "old world", and British politics began to turn away from the Commonwealth and towards Europe. This shift was reflected in Britain's cultural policies and following a brief period of Commonwealth-based art exhibitions, London's galleries displayed a distinctive French flair, suggesting cultural policies that seemed to align with governments aspirations for membership to the EEC. London galleries also increased loans of their British masterpieces to their European counterparts, signaling a shared sense of culture and promoting traditional Britishness abroad. This section will explore European art exhibitions in Britain during the 1960s and 1970s, at times reflecting the politics behind the shift in cultural policies from the Commonwealth to the EEC.

Beginning around 1964, following Britain's 1963 application to join the EEC, cultural policies began to explore the way Europe intersected with visions of newness and modernity. Examples of this change in cultural policy can be seen in three London galleries: The Tate Gallery, the Royal Academy of Arts, and the National Gallery. The discussion of cultural policy in museums in this section will focus only on London. This is for two reasons: the

---

[497] As discussed previously, these exhibitions are: *Australian Painting: Colonial, Impressionist, Contemporary* in 1963, *Canadian Painting: 1939-1963* in 1964, *Treasures of the Commonwealth* and the Commonwealth Arts Festival in 1965.

galleries listed were chosen for their accessibility (cost, location) by most Londoners and many Britons; and also, because this topic was explored in chapter four and its discussion on the Welsh and Scottish Committees, who also had used their semi-independent status within the Arts Council to create programs that promoted Wales and Scotland as gaining benefits from membership to Europe.

The Tate Gallery

Shortly after the first application to join the EEC and leading up to the 1975 referendum, there were 34 exhibitions held in leading London art galleries and museums; with 23 of the exhibitions held between 1970-1975.[498] During the Sixties, the Tate Gallery was showing on average of seven exhibitions per year; with the Royal Academy showing about four exhibitions per year.[499] Often, each year featured more than one artist from an EEC country; but there were notable exceptions. Between 1970-1975, only 1970 and 1972 displayed European artists; with American and British (or other non-European artists) taking center stage during the Seventies. Hosted at the Tate in the Sixties were 19 exhibitions showcasing European art, out of a total of 74 exhibitions. While no majority, there was a clear focus on integrating European artists into their galleries, and many of the artists were twentieth century and contemporary, instead of classical. France led with 9 total exhibitions (along with 1 Franco-German and 1 Franco-Russian exhibition); with Spain following with 4 exhibitions, Germany with 3, the Netherlands with 2, and Belgium with 1. As mentioned earlier in chapter three, Australia and Canada each had 1 exhibition during the 1960s. All other showings in the Tate were of British or American artists. In the 1970s, France, Germany, Spain, and Australia all held 1 exhibition.[500] The Royal Academy of the Arts had a much lesser showing of European artists, showing 11 European exhibitions and a solo Commonwealth exhibition between 1960 and 1975.[501]

As this data shows, the most prominent examples of European art on display were by French and German artists, and politically, this is not a coincidence. France and Germany (but especially France) were considered the powerhouses of the EEC: the fate of Britain's

---

[498] Tate Gallery Catalog, 8-13. 19 of the Tate's exhibitions in the Sixties features artists from within the EEC; 3 during the Seventies. At the Royal Academy, there were 11 exhibitions featuring EEC artists, 4 of which were shown in the Seventies (leading up to 1975). Royal Academy of the Arts Catalog.

[499] Now known as Tate Britain, this art museum was known as "The National Gallery of British Art" from 1897-1932, "The Tate Gallery" from 1932-2000, and has been known as "Tate Britain" since 2000.

[500] Tate Gallery Catalog, 8-13.

[501] Royal Academy of the Arts Catalog.

membership to the EEC was held in French President de Gaulle's hands. 1961, 1962 and 1966 held the most exhibitions: France was featured 8 times, Germany once, and a joint Franco-German exhibition held once. In these years, Britain had expressed their wishes towards European membership in 1961 and submitted their first application to join the EEC in 1963. An emphasis on French art during this period can be seen as a subtle response to Britain warming their relationship to France and demonstrates a period when politics and government priorities overlapped with, or had the potential, to influence cultural policies and decisions taken within the arts sector.

This increase in art exhibitions from artists within the European Community is also notable when considering previous exhibitions hosted by the Tate. During the Second World War, most if not all of the exhibitions focused on "Recent Wartime Acquisitions" or classics, such as pre-Raphaelites and Impressionists works; and there was also a small mix of American and Latin American art.[502] Post-war, most exhibitions continued this trend and focused on British masterpieces, Impressionist or Pre-Raphaelites, and artworks from the Americas. There were a few exceptions to this rule, most notably 1950 and 1956 which held exhibitions featuring modern Italian art, and 1962, which featured modern Spanish art.[503] When taking this into consideration, the subtle increase in exhibitions that focused on art from the EEC is quite obvious.

The Royal Academy of the Arts

The exhibitions and artists on display at The Royal Academy of the Arts had much less of an emphasis on Europe—their focus stayed with art produced within the United Kingdom; but there were still a few notable exceptions. In 1963, the Academy hosted a display of paintings and artworks by Francisco de Goya, who is often considered one of the most important and influential Spanish artists of the late-Eighteenth and early-Nineteenth centuries.[504] This exhibition was followed shortly by "Treasures of the Commonwealth" in 1965, which featured as part of the Commonwealth Arts Festival and as expected, was curated with artists from the Commonwealth or those with Commonwealth heritage. There were two further exhibitions curated from European artists, both focusing of selections of

---

[502] Tate Gallery Catalog, 3-19.

[503] Tate Gallery Catalog, 5-9.

[504] Royal Academy of Arts Catalog, 1960s and 1970s. In 1963, "Goya and his Times" displayed from December 7, 1963- March 1, 1964. For more on Goya, see: Voorhies, James. "Francisco de Goya (1746–1828) and the Spanish Enlightenment." In *Heilbrunn Timeline of Art History*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000–. http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/goya/hd_goya.htm (October 2003).

French paintings. These were "France in the Eighteenth Century", hosted in 1968 and "French Paintings since 1900", on display in 1969.[505] "Treasures of the Commonwealth", as mentioned, formed part of the Commonwealth Arts Festival, a celebration of Commonwealth culture and art that took place under the working title "The Commonwealth at Home", and was an attempt to unite widespread nations, which all shared the legacy of Empire, to establish goodwill though culture and the arts.[506] If we pair this exhibition with the two hosted by the Tate in 1963 and 1964; we have, for the only time, three consecutive years with prominent Commonwealth art on display. "Goya and his Times" formed part of the Royal Academy's 1963-1964 Winter Exhibition and went on display shortly after the Macmillan Government received their veto on joining the EEC. The two French painting exhibitions both were on display after the Wilson Government had their second application for membership refused; however, these exhibitions at the Royal Academy are too sporadic to make any solid correlations within the cultural sector using the arts to promote European membership. The exhibitions do however provide examples of European artworks being shown in galleries that traditionally focused on British artists.

By displaying predominately French and German art, there was a subtle effort at showing the integration of European art and culture in Britain, which can be suggested as exploring the "Europeanness" of Britain. These exhibitions, while small in number, suggest a subtle shift in cultural policies away from promoting the Commonwealth and former imperial territories towards Europe and her growing community. There are also connections between these European-influenced exhibitions and the discussions in chapter four, relating to the cultural policies enacted by the Welsh and Scottish Committees. Occurring in the same time period, Wales used modern art exhibitions to depict Wales as a vibrant and contemporary striking nation with her own identity. During the late 1960s, the Welsh national party Plaid Cymru would look to Europe as the vehicle to rebrand Wales as being "Welsh-European", using her museums, galleries, and music scene to intersect with the newness of the European Community[507]. As demonstrated by the programs funded and developed under the direction

---

[505] Royal Academy of Arts Catalogue, 1960s and 1970s. "Treasures from the Commonwealth" was on display from September 17- November 13, 1965. The two French exhibitions were "France in the Eighteenth Century" from January 6-March 3, 1968; and "French Paintings since 1900" from August 30-November 30, 1969.
[506] Gail Low, "At Home? Discoursing on the Commonwealth at the 1965 Commonwealth Arts Festival." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*48, no. 1 (March 2013): 97–111. doi:10.1177/0021989412471838.
[507] A good discussion of this can be found in Robert Saunders' *Yes to Europe!* (2018), especially Chapter 12: Cymru yn Ewrop: Wales in Europe; and also, John Harris, "A Welsh European: Golf, Tourism and the Remaking of National Imaging," (October 2016).

of the Scottish Community, Scotland was promoted as relevant and a key player to both the United Kingdom and the European Community due to its heritage and uniqueness. Both nations used their relatively semi-independent status within the Arts Council to create programs and exhibitions that explored the nations in a context outside of England, presenting themselves in a manner more like a smaller European country than a part of the United Kingdom. We can view this as a similar approach that was being taken by the London galleries discussed in this section. The increased number of European art exhibitions from the mid-1960s to early-1970s, especially around the dates of Britain's three applications for membership of the European Community, further suggests periods when cultural policies can be seen to align with government priorities. As British policymakers began to look towards Europe of economic stability and political influence, the role of the arts and their interactions with society in some instances also shifted towards a more European outlook. Alongside London's galleries and museums increasing their number of European art exhibitions, loans of British art to Europe also increased during this period; as discussed in the next section.

6.3: European Exhibitions of British Art

Noting that the presence of European art and culture has always been inside Britain's art galleries and adorning the walls of her stately homes, following British membership to the EEC there is a noticed increase in, and support for, cultural exchange programs *between* Britain and the European Community. Located within the National Archives is a record of insurance and identification for a series of loans on behalf of the British Council for European exhibitions. While many of the programs for these exhibitions no longer exist, the insurance records provide evidence that the exhibitions were curated with some substantial loans.[508]

In 1972, The British Embassy and The Hague, Netherlands, secured objects for 1973's "Treasures from the European Community", held at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, as part of the "Fanfare for Europe" festival celebrating British membership to the Common Market.[509] Also in 1972, The British council secured the loaning of two paintings from the Tate Gallery for an exhibition in the Museum of Modern Art in Paris, entitled "Exhibition of British Painting", held January to March 1973. These paintings were "Benches

---

[508] TNA, FCO 13/530, Unclassified, Cultural Relations, Insurance or Indemnification of Works of art Borrowed by British Council for Exhibitions Overseas.

[509] TNA, FCO 13/530, "British Embassy, The Hague" correspondences, December 22, 1972.

1970/71" by Tom Phillips and "Quadrama IV 1969" by Ian Stephenson and had been fairly recent acquisitions and were being loaned for the first time.[510] The British Council, in addition to their loans for the Museum of Modern Art in Paris, also provided objects for an "Exhibition of British Delftware", held at the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. This exhibition contained works from the national collections including the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, as well as private collections.[511]

Outside of European Community, in the Soviet Bloc, British art was also being displayed. In Romania and Hungary in 1972 and 1973 were British exhibitions, aptly entitled "British Portrait Exhibition".[512] Held in Bucharest in November 1972 and Budapest in February 1973, this exhibition included 26 items of period clothing lent from the Department of Textiles at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, to accompany the portraits on display.[513] The items of historical dress lent from the Victoria and Albert were specifically chosen to accompany the portraits being displayed. For example, a crinoline ball gown would be displayed next to a chosen portrait where the depicted sitter is wearing something similar. Like many of the other exhibitions that were occurring at this period, these were arranged by the British Council, and the paintings featured were loaned by the National Gallery, Victoria and Albert, and British Museum. These loans suggest that while there was a noticed emphasis on loans between EEC member states, the use of art for diplomatic purposes allowed for a soft British influence abroad; in this case, the role of Britain during the Cold War and the want of influence in Eastern European countries.[514]

During the period of 1961-1975, we see a subtle increase in loans between British and European museums and galleries. These loans occurred while Britain was trying to politically gain entry to the EEC, and given that we know the Foreign Office served as the main governmental organization for promoting the EEC to British audiences, we can view the exhibitions as a politically motivated decision to influence public opinion on membership to the Common Market and help change perceptions of British identity. By showcasing European art in Britain, those visiting the galleries would be presented with a narrative of a

---

[510] TNA, FCO 13/530

[511] TNA, FCO 13/530 "Exhibition of British Delftware".

[512] TNA, FCO 13/350, "British Portrait Exhibition"

[513] TNA, FCO 13/350, "British Portrait Exhibition"

[514] For more on British influences on the Soviet Bloc during the Cold War, see: J.M. Lee, "British Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War: 1946-1961", *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 9, no. 1 (March 1998). If interested in British cultural policy during this period elsewhere, see: Vaughn, James R. "'A Certain Idea of Britain': British Cultural Diplomacy in the Middle East, 1945-57." *Contemporary British History* 19, no. 2 (June 2005): 151-68.

shared culture. This tactic of mobilizing culture to help remake Britons as Europeans echoes the earlier demonstrations of Commonwealth art and sculpture, which used cultural ties to suggest a shared bond between Britain and the Commonwealth. Members of the Commonwealth are viewed as British, and now, Britons are European.

Conclusion

As discussed in the previous chapters, cultural policies and government support shaped the types of exhibitions that museums and galleries hosted. Alongside festivals such as the *Commonwealth Arts Festival*, *Fanfare for Europe*, and the *Festival of Britain,* exhibitions that aligned with the priorities of governments and political parties demonstrate periods when the arts and politics become intertwined. As demonstrated in both this chapter and chapter five, art exhibitions and festivals often were staged in conjunction with each other, and usually as a reflection of the conversations that were happening within Whitehall, and political aspirations or priorities. Art exhibitions featuring the Commonwealth or Europe were staged while British politicians were focusing on these two entities as vehicles for influence, position and power, and also economic success. The cultural policies during this period reflect these transitions in political influence, in an attempt to shape culture to reflect these changes to society.

Chapter Seven: Conclusion

From its examination of the creation, implementation, and development of cultural policies in Britain, this thesis can draw a number of conclusions on policies relating to the arts and culture in British society since 1940.

This thesis explored periods in which cultural policies seemed to align with government aspirations and priorities, providing examples of how the role of government can affect the arts, both positively and negatively. As the discussions relating to the growth of the Arts Council made clear, the influences of politics could be seen to positively affect the arts, but only when it was politically beneficial to have a strong arts program. This was seen with increases in funding during the Festival of Britain, when the Arts Council received vast sums from the Treasury. This resulted in the Arts Council funding many of the artists who produced works for the Festival of Britain, helping to create a Festival for Britain that featured contemporary art and design that supplemented Labour's views of modernism in the early 1950s. During Jennie Lee's tenure as Minister for the Arts, more funding was diverted towards Wales and Scotland, allowing for the arts councils in those nations to curate exhibitions and fund venues that best reflected their character and national interest. An example of this is the use of contemporary art in Wales to present the nation as being modern and progressive. However, we also saw the contrast to this when funding for the arts was minimal and often below inflation during the 1970s and 1980s, a period when a relatively hands-off approach to the arts was felt within the Treasury and government. The restriction of funding for the arts was felt keenly in the 1970s, and the Arts Council reported struggles to maintain commitments and supporting more regional-based arts programs. What can be concluded from this discussion is the understanding that the arts generally only received ample or above-inflation increases in funding when it was seen as being beneficial to the government and the Treasury to have a strong arts program. This was demonstrated when the Arts Council had substantive increases in funding during the Festival of Britain, the Fanfare for Europe, and also, when members of government, like Jennie Lee and Hugh Jenkins, supported the arts and advocated for its financial support to government.

This thesis has contributed to the historiography by freshly examining a period which covers the loss of empire and turn towards Europe. As the literature review revealed, many publications examine Britain during her applications to join the European Community with a focus on traditional questions of diplomacy, politics, and economics. Instead, this thesis

looked at documents and materials through a lens of arts and culture, asking more about the purpose of a festival or exhibition, what it hoped to achieve, and less about what the outcome of the event was (this was of course looked at, also). When reading these documents, close attention was paid to the geopolitical context in which the documents were situated, and the materials presented themselves in a light often overlooked by historians focusing more exclusively on politics. Whilst politics does feature throughout this thesis, it is more so to provide context for these discussions, or to explore how government involvement in the arts shapes the role and presence of the arts in society.

Perhaps the biggest contribution this thesis makes to the historiography is in the demonstration that in the post-war era, there have continually been factions of government or political parties who understood the importance of using the arts to support, or present, their own agenda. This was evidenced when the Labour Party used arts-based festivals to showcase their versions of modernity, to promote their party's policies. Whereas the Festival of Britain showcased Britain's modernity and created an outline for Britain's next decade, the Festival of Labour used the arts to reinvigorate the party and Labour's new forms of modernity. One of the aims of this alignment was to associate Labour with a forward-looking and dynamic vision that understood how technology, design, and art could enrich people's lives. This concept was also considered in the thesis's discussions on the use of art exhibitions featuring the Commonwealth, and Britain's cultural connections. Staged during periods of decolonization, when British politics focused more on the Commonwealth than the loss of empire, Commonwealth arts exhibitions mixed with the government-supported Commonwealth Arts Festival to present a new narrative that viewed Britons as having an Anglo-Commonwealth identity. The politicization of the arts during the 1960s and 1970s resulted in transient cultural policies that saw exhibitions and festivals promoting the Commonwealth, in-line with government priorities, then rapidly shifting towards a focus on European art reflecting Britain's changing relationship with the European Community.

The heavy-handed influence on the direction of the arts was keenly felt within the Fanfare for Europe, with Prime Minister Heath writing that the Fanfare for Europe was a celebration of new challenges and new opportunities arising with British membership of the European Community, with Britain having much to contribute and gain from the forming of a new Europe.[515] The Fanfare for Europe, along with British exhibitions of art from members

---

[515] Edward Heath, "Fanfare for Europe: Message from the Prime Minister", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.

of the European Community evidenced subtly the influence of Whitehall into the Arts Council and museums. The same can be found with the development of Anglo-European exchange programs. These sought to move the discussion from "high" art exchanges between museums towards civic-based exchanges within education and local councils and communities; the purpose of which was to make cultural shifts and connections that reflected government's priorities during the turn towards Europe. The embrace of these programs shows the success of these cultural policies, but in remembering that other councils, such as Harrow, did not engage in the programs reveals that cultural policies did not impact as many as hoped, or were not as successful as anticipated.

Alongside cultural policies and the political manipulation of the arts, modernity was another reoccurring theme in this thesis. And, like the cultural policies discussed, interpretations of modernity by political parties during these decades was also transient and regularly adapted to reflect government aspirations and priorities. Labour in the late 1940s viewed modernity in the form of establishing a welfare state, and an embrace of technology and contemporary living standards. Under the Conservatives in the mid-to-late 1950s, modernism was viewed as a synonym for economic growth, which included the success of Britain and the Commonwealth of Nations as a successor to Empire, in terms of trade and political influence. Modernism was again repurposed by the Labour Party in the 1960s to reflect a transition towards a more egalitarian, classless society, which Labour felt could be achieved by harnessing the technological revolution that was occurring across Britain during this period. And in the 1970s, modernity was associated with a new national project: Britain's membership of the European Community and entry into the Common Market. We are able to see subtle connections between the arts and politics by linking transient definitions of modernity with cultural policies.

These arguments point to the importance of this thesis for the study of post-war British culture as a whole. The existing historiography of this period focuses heavily on politics, youth culture, and identity, but often overlooks the role of cultural policy in shaping and responding to politics. This thesis challenges this existing narrative in its examinations of how politics shaped cultural policies and understanding that the arts are often intertwined with politics, and there are times when this relationship was mutually beneficial. Another view that can be taken is that each of the case studies are examples of culture being used as

evidence for Britain's relevance and modern approaches to society and politics, but also shows a timeline of British politicians and their respective parties continually reshaping themselves and their policies in order to stay current and electable (in simple terms: "we are modern—here is the proof, here is why we should be in office"), which at times was reflected in cultural activities and government support for arts initiatives. Both Labour and Conservative governments understood the possible advantages of integrating with the arts, and there were periods of increased financial support that reflect this.

By revisiting archival sources, official publications, and the press, it was possible to identify impacts politics had on cultural policies or how Britain's leading political parties used methods for reframing Britain's global position that also produced changes within the arts and cultural sectors. This thesis suggests that it is possible to discuss this era through a prism of culture that doesn't focus on popular cultural myths of "blitz spirit" or "Swinging London and Carnaby Street" that often define this era, instead exploring lesser known or forgotten movements within museums, art galleries, and literature. Instead of relating Mary Quant to the 1960s, perhaps instead we can think of Embu dancers performing in Trafalgar Square, or Australian artwork gracing the Tate.

List of Sources

Primary

Archives

The National Archives, Kew (TNA)

BD 23/156 (Panel for Cultural Affairs: The arts in Wales, 1964-1966)

BD 23/162 (Provisions for the Arts in Welsh Schools)

BD 24/95 (Miscellaneous Welsh Bodies: Arts Council in Wales)

BW 1/517 (Commonwealth Arts Festival in the UK, 1965: Preparations)

BW 2/616 (Arts Council of Great Britain, Art Panel Minutes, 1941-1959)

BW 31/63 (Anglo-French relations 1970-73, science, education, cultural relations)

CAB 124/1220 (British Commonwealth Participation- Festival of Britain 1951)

CAB 134/1551 (Official Committee on Colonial Policy, 1957)

CO 554/1387 (Gold Coast independence celebrations: appointment of the Queen's representative, Duchess of Kent, 1956-57)

CO 554/2524 (Princess Alexandra of Kent- Nigerian Independence, 1960)

CO 554/2527 (Princess Alexandra opening Nigerian Parliament following Independence, 1960)

CO 1030/848 (Royal Visit of HRH Duke and Duchess of Gloucester for Malayan Independence Ceremonies, 1957)

DO 35/2209 (Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, 1949) (Meeting minutes)

DO 35/2211 (1949, Discusses nationality of Commonwealth Citizens (India) and their relation to the UK)

DO 35/2212 (Documents relating to India Bill- Commonwealth, 1949) (Titles for Sovereign under Commonwealth countries) (1949, George VI)

DO 35/5056 (Future admission of colonial territories to full Commonwealth membership, 1952-54)

DO 35/8095 (British Colonial territories in Southwest Pacific)

DO 163/105 (Commonwealth Arts Festival) (Ian Hunter Correspondences and notes)

DO 163/106 (Commonwealth Arts Festival) (Correspondences)

DO 163/107 (Commonwealth Arts Festival) (Memorandums and Festival planning notes)

FCO 13/510 (Proposals for Cultural Events Marking Entry to EEC)

FCO 13/352 (British Council: European Representatives' Conference)

FCO 13/526 (Greater London Council Mayoral visits) (EEC Fanfare)

FCO 13/529 (Scottish Fanfare for Europe Committee)

FCO 13/530 (Unclassified, Cultural Relations) (Insurance or Indemnification of Works of art Borrowed by British Council for Exhibitions Overseas)

FCO 26/1111 (Exhibition to be held in 1973)

FCO 32/336 (Princess Alexandra's visit to Mauritius for Independence celebrations, 1967-68)

FCO 32/337 (Princess Alexandra's visit to Mauritius for Independence celebrations, 1967-68)

FO 37/76814 (Education: General Policy, German Educational Reconstruction Council, 1949.)

PREM 11/1138 (Lessons after Suez: Personal thoughts of the Prime Minister)

PREM 11/1160 (Recalling Parliament during the Suez Crisis)

PREM 11/4415 (Public Opinion and the Common Market, 9/18/62)

PREM 11/2068 (HRH Duke of Gloucester to represent Queen at independence ceremonies)

PREM 13/3250 (Histories: Government arrangements for the release of WWII records)

PREM 11/3804 (German relations and Germany policy, 1962)

PREM 11/3851 (Princess Margaret's visit to Jamaica for independence ceremonies, 1962)

PREM 13/358 (Arts Council notes and meetings, establishment of; appt. of Jennie Lee to DES)

PREM 13/4 (British Commonwealth, 1964)

PREM 13/721 (White Paper, Arts and Amenities, Arts Council)

PREM 15/62 (EEC Negotiations, CHOGM Singapore 1971, EEC and Sterling) (Application to join the EEC under Heath) (European Policy 1970)

T 224/2528 (Britain in Europe Exhibition: A London Exhibition to Celebrate Britain's Entry into the European Economic Community)

WORK 25/8 (Festival of Britain planning)

WORK 25/48 (Festival of Britain planning and design)

WORK 25/244 (Arts Council and the Festival of Britain, 1949-51)

WORK 25/346 (Trafalgar Square: Commonwealth Arts Festival, 1965)

Labour Party Archives (LPA)

Box 88- uncatalogued Labour Party meeting minutes,

"Government and the Arts", (London, 1961), Conservative Party.

John Elsom, "The Arts: Change and Choice" 23 May 1979.

"Leisure for Living", (London, 1959), Labour Party.

"Labour Party Manifesto for the 1964 General Election: Let's GO with Labour for the New Britain"

Labour Party Research Series, RE. 348-397, 1968 ("Study Group on Immigration/ British Foreign Policy and our Commonwealth")

NAD/FOL/1/2 (Festival of Labour planning)

NAD/ FOL/ 1/3 (Festival of Labour correspondence and press releases)

NAD/ FOL/1/5 (Festival of Labour booklets and materials)

LPA: Box 1: NAD/FOL/1/8 (Festival of Labour exhibitions)

LPA: Box 7: NAD/FOL/4/5 (Festival of Labour, Prints of the World exhibition)

NAD/FOL/6/4 (Festival of Labour, New Arts Exhibitions)

Richard Carless, Patricia Brewster, "Patronage and the Arts" (London 1959), 15.

"Talking Points", 12 February 1971, No. 2.

Other Archives

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1945-1946." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1946.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1946-1947." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1947.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1947-1948" London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1948.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1950-1951." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1950.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1951-1952." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1952.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1953-1954." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1954.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1954-1955." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1955

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1956-1957." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1957.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1961-1962." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1962.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1964-1965." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1965.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1965-1966." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1966.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1966-1967." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1967.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1967-1968." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1968.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1971-1972." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1972.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1973-1974." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1974

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1975-1976." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1976.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1982-1983." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1983

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1988-1989." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1989.

"The Arts Council of Great Britain Annual Report 1992-1993." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1993.

"The Arts Council of England Annual Report 1994-1995." London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1995.

Legislation

British Nationality Act 1948, c.56. Available at: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/11-12/56/enacted

HC Deb 26 February 1960, Vol. 618 CC789-91.

Hansard, HC Deb. 23 January 1967, Vol. 739, CC-188-90W.

Hansard, HL Deb. 27 May 1895, Vol. 34 CC327-30.

Statute of Westminster, 1931. Available at https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/22-23/4/contents.

Speeches

Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. "Christmas Broadcast 1972". Buckingham Palace, 25 December 1972.

Articles

de Smith, S.A. "The London Declaration of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers, April 28, 1949" *The Modern Law Review* 12, no. 3 (1949): 351-354. Accessed February 19, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1090506

Crowe, Brian L. "British Entry into the Common Market: A British View." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 37, no. 2 (1972): 228-232. Accessed November 15, 2018. doi:10.2307/1191149.

Green, Michael, Michael Wilding, and Richard Hoggart. Rep. *Cultural Policy in Great Britain*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 1970.

Jacques, Reginald. "The Work of the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts." *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* 93, no. 4690 (April 27, 1945): 275–84. Accessed January 30, 2021. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41362933.

Lane, Terence M. "Legal Implications of British Entry into the Common Market." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 37, no. 2 (1972): 359. Accessed November 16, 2018. doi:10.2307/1191159.

Larson, Cedric. "The British Ministry of Information." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1941): 412–31. Accessed February 8, 2021. https://doi.org/jstor.org/stable/2745133.

Onslow, C. G. D. "West German Rearmament." *World Politics* 3, no. 4 (July 1951): 450–85. https://doi.org/10.2307/2008892.

Shank, Donald J. "The American Goes Abroad." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 335 (May 1961): 99–111. www.jstor.org/stable/1033261.

"V&A · The Festival of Britain." Victoria and Albert Museum. Accessed February 5, 2020. https://www.vam.ac.uk/articles/the-festival-of-britain.

Wade, E.C.S. "British Nationality Act, 1948". *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law* 30, no. 3/4 (1948): 67-75. Accessed 7 February 2020. https://www.jstor.org/stable/754289.

Books

Benn, Tony. *Office Without Power: Diaries 1968-72*. London: Arrow Books Limited, 1988.

Castle, Barbara. *The Castle Diaries, 1964-1976*. London: Papermac, 1990.

Crosland, Anthony. *The Future of Socialism: The Book that Changed British Politics*. London: Constable, 2006.

Ingram, Derek. *The Commonwealth Challenge*. London: George Alleen & Unwin Ltd, 1962.

Jones, Gwyn. "Structure 1966 Catalogue". Cardiff: Welsh Arts Council, National Museum of Wales, 1966.

Kitchin, Rob, and N. J. Thrift. *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2009.

Levin, Bernard. *The Pendulum Years: Britain and the Sixties*. London: Edenzer Baylis and Son, Ltd., 1970.

Williams, Marcia. *Inside Number 10*. London: New English Library Ltd, 1975.

Wilson, Harold. *The Labour Government, 1964-1970: A Personal Record*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971

Newspaper/Media

"1951 Festival of Britain", *The Scotsman*, 11 February 1949.

"1951 Festival of Britain: Compiling Stock Lists of Exhibits", *Londonderry Sentinel"*, 13 October 1949.

"200,000 Watch Queen's Drive", *Coventry Evening Standard*, 20 February 1963.

"After the Town Twinning Success", *Kensington Post*, 18 December 1970.

"Britain Not To Free Nazi War Criminals—MP's Are Told", *Daily Mirror*, 8 February 1951.

"CEMA", *The Stage*, 27 May 1943.

"CEMA", *The Stage,* 26 April 1945.

"Critical Years", *Evening Herald (Dublin)*, 15 January 1951.

"D-Day veterans for Portsmouth celebrations", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 5 June 1965.

"D-Day veterans to march again", *Belfast Telegraph*, 5 June 1965.

Dent, Alan. "Life's Journey from Sweden", *Illustrated London News*, 15 November 1958.

"Emergency as big blackout looms near", *Newcastle Journal*, 9 February 1972.

Everitt, Anthony. "Old Fashioned Girls", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 3 February 1973.

"Final Round-Up of Nazi War Criminals", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 26 January 1960.

"French Fears", *Daily Herald*, 30 September 1954.

"German Rearmament is 'a step towards war'", *Northern Whig*, 24 July 1954.

"German Generals for Trial", *The Scotsman*, 28 August 1947.

Heath, Edward. "Fanfare for Europe: Programme of Events, January 3-13", *Illustrated London News*, 1 January 1973.

"Ice Cold in Alex!" *Nelson Leader*, 5 September 1958.

"If Manstein is Guilty, so is Churchill", *Gloucester Citizen*, 23 November 1949.

"It's the best since 'The Cruel Sea'", *Daily Herald*, 20 May 1955.

"It was the film of the year", *Drogheda Argus and Leinster Journal*, 5 April 1958

"Issue at Manstein Trial: Should a General Disobey Orders?", *Staffordshire Sentinel*, 5 October 1949.

Kelly, Jon. "Why are towns un-twinning?", *BBC News Magazine*, 5 January 2012.

"Kwai Film is No.2 Hit", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 10 February 1959.

"La Dolce Vita", *The Sphere*, 10 December 1960.

"Last Ship Leaves Clyde Yard That Built 'Queens'", *The New York Times*, 6 October 1972.

"Living in Hitler's Shadow", *Brimingham Daily Post*, 30 October 1968.

"Manstein Pleads Not Guilty to All Charges", *Dundee Evening Telegraph*, 24 August 1949.

Matthews, Geoff. "Youth—and a war they never knew", *Reading Evening Post*, 20 June 1969.

"Nazi Generals Sent Home for War Crimes Trial". *Belfast Telegraph*, 7 October 1947.

"Newcomers", *Westminster and Pimlico News,* 22 May 1970.

"Now what do the youngster's think?", *Reading Evening Post*, 19 June 1969.

"Princess Sees Dam Busters Film Premier", *Belfast Telegraph*, 17 May 1955.

"Searchlights and A.A. guns at film premiere", *Belfast News-Letter*, 13 September 1955.

Searle, Muriel. "Memories of Street's VE Day celebrations 25 years ago", *Cheddar Valley Gazette*, 29 May 1970.

"Starting Today—The Great Euro Show", *Daily Mirror*, 3 January 1973

"The CEMA", *The Stage*. 25 April 1940.

"The Epic Battle of the River Plate", *Liverpool Echo*, 24 December 1956.

"The Return of the Victorian Arabesque", *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 August 1974.

Thompson, Ron. "This film is a winner!", *Norwood News*, 14 February 1958

"To Bind Sister Cities", *Dundee Courier,* 15 March 1946.

"Town Twinning Suggestion is Turned Down", *Harrow Observer,* 24 October 1972.

"Triumphant voyage will recall D Day landings", *Runcorn Daily News*, 24 April 1969.

"Twelfth Night: The Walter Hudd Production for CEMA at Coventry", *The Tatler*, 6 October 1943.

"Von Manstein Gets 18 Years' Sentence", *Londonderry Sentinel*, 20 December 1949.

"Von Manstein is Released", *Sunderland Daily Echo and Shipping Gazette*, 7 May 1953.

"War Crimes." *Belfast News-Letter*, 17 November 1945.

"West could win—with Germany", *Coventry Evening Telegraph*, 30 September 1954.

Other Primary Sources:

"About Us." National Eisteddfod -. Accessed August 17, 2021. https://eisteddfod.wales/about-us.

Dempsey, N. (2016) *Arts Funding: Statistics*. House of Commons Library Briefing Paper no. CBP 7655. London: House of Commons Library. [Online] [Accessed on November 11 2020]. file:///C:/Users/174501/Downloads/CBP-7655%20(1).pdf.

"The Journal of Commonwealth Literature." SAGE Publications Ltd, February 22, 2020. https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal/journal-commonwealth-literature.

"History." The Pilgrim Trust. Accessed December 7, 2021. https://www.thepilgrimtrust.org.uk/about-us/history/.

Hendy, Julian, and Michael Proudfoot. *"1951 Festival of Britain: A Brave New World"*. United Kingdom: BBC Two, 2011. Video. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Vmzq1s7xgE.

NATO. "A Short History of NATO." NATO. Accessed January 28, 2022. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/declassified_139339.htm.

The National Films Council of the Department of Information. *"CEMA"*. United Kingdom, 1942.Video. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6FDfP2L6Fak

"Our History." The Commonwealth, February 28, 2020. Accessed October 12, 2021. https://thecommonwealth.org/about-us/history.

RCIN 200174 - The Oriental tiara. Retrieved November 12, 2020, from https://www.rct.uk/collection/themes/exhibitions/victoria-albert-art-love/the-queens-gallery-buckingham-palace/the-oriental-tiara.

"Review: The Rosetta Stone by Robert Sole and Dominique Valbelle." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, September 22, 2001. https://www.theguardian.com/books/2001/sep/22/historybooks.highereducation1.

"Selling Cartier's Tutti Frutti Jewelry." Sothebys.com. Accessed November 12, 2020. https://www.sothebys.com/en/sell/jewelry/cartier/tutti-frutti.

Tate. "Modernism – Art Term." Tate.org.uk. Accessed September 17, 2021. https://www.tate.org.uk/art/art-terms/m/modernism

"Universal Free Admission to the UK's National Museums." Centre for Public Impact (CPI). Accessed October 26, 2020. https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/case-study/free-entry-to-museums-in-the-uk/.

Secondary

Articles

Adityo, Alvin, Anggari Harapan, and Djoko Marinandono. "Re-Examining De Gaulle's Rejection of British Membership in the European Economic Community." *Eastern Journal of European Studies* 10, no. 2 (December 2019): 5–18.

Anderson, David M. "British Abuse and Torture in Kenya's Counter-Insurgency, 1952–1960." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 23, no. 4-5 (2012): 700–719. Accessed February 18, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2012.709760.

Ashton, S.R. "Burma, Britain, and the Commonwealth, 1946-56." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 29, no. 1 (2001): 65-91. Accessed February 26, 2019). DOI: 10.1080/03086530108583112

Ashton, S.R. "Mountbatten, the Royal Family, and British Influence in Post-independence India and Burma." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 33, no. 1 (2005): 73-92. Accessed February 26, 2019. doi:10.1080/0308653042000329021.

Black, Lawrence. "The Festival of Labour, 1962." Labour Pains, November 15, 2016. http://www.labourpains.group.shef.ac.uk/the-festival-of-labour-1962/.

Bloxham, Donald. "Genocide on Trial: Law and Collective Memory" in *The Nuremberg Trials: International Criminal Law Since 1945: 60th Anniversary International Conference,* edited by Herbert R. Reginbogin and Christoph Safferling, 73-85. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110944846.73.

Calhoun, Craig. "Cosmopolitanism in the Modern Social Imaginary." *Daedalus* 137, no. 3 (2008): 105–14. https://doi.org/10.1162/daed.2008.137.3.105.

Cesarani, David. "The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg: British Perspectives" in *The Nuremberg Trials: International Criminal Law Since 1945: 60th Anniversary International Conference,* edited by Herbert R. Reginbogin and Christoph Safferling, 73-85. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Saur, 2011. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110944846.31.

Chapman, James. *Cinemas of the World: Film and Society from 1895 to the Present*. London: Reaktion Books LTD, 2003.

Clarke, Nick. "Town Twinning in Cold-War Britain: (Dis)continuities in Twentieth-Century Municipal Internationalism." *Contemporary British History* 24, no. 2 (April 28, 2010): 173-91. Accessed August 13, 2019. doi:10.1080/13619461003768272.

Cowling, Daniel. "Anglo–German Relations After 1945." *Journal of Contemporary History* 54, no. 1 (2017): 82–111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022009417697808.

Conekin, Becky E. "From Haughty to Nice: How British Fashion Images Changed from the 1950s to the 1960s." *Photography and Culture* 3, no. 3 (2010): 283-96. Accessed November 14, 2018. doi:10.2752/175145109x12804957025552.

Craggs, Ruth. "The Commonwealth Institute and the Commonwealth Arts Festival: Architecture, Performance and Multiculturalism in Late-Imperial London." *The London Journal* 36, no. 3 (2011): 247–68. Accessed February 12, 2020. doi.org/10.1179/174963211x13127325480352.

Coultass, Clive. "British Feature Films and the Second World War." *Journal of Contemporary History* 19, no. 1 (1984): 7-22. Accessed July 21, 2021. http://www.jstor.org/stable/260423.

Eley, Geoff. "Finding the Peoples War: Film, British Collective Memory, and World War II." *The American Historical Review* 106, no. 3 (June 2001): 818. Accessed July 10, 2019. doi:10.2307/2692326.

"The Festival of Britain 1951." The History Press. Accessed February 5, 2020. https://www.thehistorypress.co.uk/articles/the-festival-of-britain-1951/.

Freedman, Carl. "England as Ideology: From 'Upstairs, Downstairs' to 'A Room with a View.'" *Cultural Critique*, no. 17 (1990): 79–106. https://doi.org/10.2307/1354140.

Gliddon, Paul. "The British Foreign Office and Domestic Propaganda on the European Community, 1960–72." *Contemporary British History* 23, no. 2 (May 26, 2009): 155-80. Accessed August 13, 2019. doi:10.1080/13619460802636383.

Haeussler, M. "The Popular Press and Ideas of Europe: The Daily Mirror, the Daily Express, and Britain's First Application to Join the EEC, 1961-63." *Twentieth Century British History* 25, no. 1 (2012): 108-31. Accessed November 12, 2018. doi:10.1093/tcbh/hws050.

Hammond, Andrew. "British Literary Responses to the Suez Crisis." *Literature & History* 22, no. 2 (Autumn 2013): 53-72. Accessed August 13, 2019. doi:10.7227/lh.22.2.4.

Heffernan, Richard, et al. *Developments in British Politics Ten*. London: Palgrave, 2016.

Hendy, David. "Caribbean Voices - History of the BBC." BBC News. BBC. Accessed February 24, 2020. https://www.bbc.com/historyofthebbc/100-voices/people-nation-empire/caribbean-voices.

Jones, Huw David "'An Art of Our Own': State Patronage of the Visual Arts in Wales, 1945–1967," *Contemporary British History* 27, no. 1 (2013): 44-64. Accessed September 7, 2021. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/13619462.2012.685690.

Jones, Huw David and Susan Galloway. "The Scottish Dimension of the British Arts Government: A Historical Perspective", *Cultural Trends* 19, no.1 (2010): 27-40. Accessed September 7, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1080/09548961003695981

Kottos, Laura. "A 'European Commonwealth': Britain, the European League for Economic Co-operation, and European Debates on Empire, 1947- 1957." *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 20, no.4 (2012): 497-515. Accessed February 26, 2019. doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2012.737665.

Langenohl, Andreas. "The Merits of Reciprocity: Small-Town Twinning in the Wake of the Second World War." *Journal of Borderlands Studies* 32, no. 4 (2016): 557–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/08865655.2016.1244648.

Lee, J.M. "British Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War: 1946–61." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 9, no. 1 (March 1998): 112-34. Accessed March 19, 2019. doi:10.1080/09592299808406072.

Low, Gail. "At Home? Discoursing on the Commonwealth at the 1965 Commonwealth Arts Festival." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 48, no. 1 (March 2013): 97–111. Accessed February 10, 2020. doi:10.1177/0021989412471838.

Ludlow, N. Piers. "The Discomforts of Life on the Edge: Britain and Europe, 1963-1975." *International Affairs* 88, no. 6 (2012): 1331-1340. Accessed November 19, 2018. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01135.

May, Alex. "The Commonwealth and Britain's Turn to Europe, 1945-73." *The Round Table* 102, no. 1 (January 29, 2013): 29-39. Accessed February 26, 2019. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00358533.2013.764082.

Marshall, Peter. "The Commonwealth at 60", *The Round Table*, vol. 98, no. 404 (2009), 535-536.

Michail, Evgenios. "After The War and After The Wall: British Perspectives on Germany Following 1945 and 1989." *University of Sussex Journal of Contemporary History* 3 (2001): 1–12. Accessed October 18, 2021.

Mulcahy, Kevin. "Cultural Policy: Definitions and Theoretical Approaches." *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 35, no. 4 (2006): 319–30. Accessed December 1, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3200/jaml.35.4.319-330.

Murphy, Philip. "Independence Day and the Crown." *The Round Table* 97, no. 398 (October 10, 2008): 667-75. Accessed February 13, 2019. doi:10.1080/00358530802327852.

Natarajan, Radhika. "Performing Multiculturalism: The Commonwealth Arts Festival of 1965." *Journal of British Studies* 53, no. 3 (July 2014): 705–33. Accessed February 11, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2014.104.

O'Sullivan, Kevin. "'Winds of Change': Decolonisation in British West Africa." *History Ireland* 4, no. 14 (July/August 2006): 40-45. Accessed February 26, 2019. www.jstor.org/stable/27725487.

Peach, A. "Craft, Souvenirs and the Commodification of National Identity in 1970s Scotland." *Journal of Design History* 20, no. 3 (2007): 243-57. Accessed February 13, 2019. doi:10.1093/jdh/epm015.

Preston, P. W. "Cutting Scotland Loose: Soft Nationalism and Independence-in-Europe." *England after the Great Recession*, 2012, 91-105. Accessed February 13, 2019. doi:10.1057/9780230355675_5.

Ramsden, John. "Refocusing 'The Peoples War': British War Films of the 1950s." *Journal of Contemporary History* 33, no. 1 (January 1998): 35–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/003200949803300103.

Schrafstetter, Susanna. "'Gentlemen, the Cheese is all Gone!' British POWs, the 'Great Escape' and the Anglo-German Agreement for Compensation to Victims of Nazism" *Contemporary European History* 17 (2008): 23-43.doi:10.1017/S0960777307004262.

Scott, Sarah. "Art, Cold War Diplomacy and Commonwealth: Australian and Canadian Art at the Tate Gallery 1962–1964." *Journal of Australian Studies* 41, no. 4 (2017): 487-502. Accessed March 15, 2019. doi:10.1080/14443058.2017.1382552.

Stokes, Melvin and Jones, Matthew. "Windows on the World: Memories of a European cinema in 1960s Britain". *Memory Studies* 10, no. 1. (2017): 78-90. Accessed April 10, 2019. DOI: 10.11177/1750698016670794

Summerfield, Penny. "Public Memory Or Public Amnesia? British Women of the Second World War in Popular Films of the 1950s and 1960s." *The Journal of British Studies* 48, no. 4 (2009): 935-957. Accessed October 21, 2021. DOI: 10.1086/603598.

Summerfield, Penny. "War, Film, Memory: Some Reflections on War Films and the Social Configuration of Memory in Britain in the 1940s and 1950s." *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 1, no. 1 (August 16, 2007): 15–23. Accessed July 10, 2021. https://doi.org/10.1386/jwcs.1.1.15_0.

Thomas, Martin and Andrew Thompson. "Empire and Globalisation: from 'High Imperialism' to Decolonisation" *The International History Review* 36, no. 1 (2014): 142-170. Accessed February 26, 2019. DOI: 10.1080/07075332.2013.828643.

Williams, Melanie. "The Most Explosive Object to Hit Britain since the V2!": The British Films of Hardy Kruger and Anglo-German Relations during the 1950s. *Cinema Journal* 46, no.1 (Autumn 2006): 85-107. Accessed March 22, 2019. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4137153

Wittlinger, Ruth. "British-German Relations and Collective Memory." *German Politics and Society* 25, no. 3 (Autumn 2007): 42-69. Accessed July 25, 2019. doi:10.3167/gps.2007.250303.

Wittlinger, Ruth. "Perceptions of Germany and Germans in Post-War Britain." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 25, no. 5 (2004): 453-65. Accessed July 25, 2019. Doi: 10.1080/01434630408668918.

Books

Bartlett, CJ. *A History of Postwar Britain, 1945-1974*. New York: Longman Inc, 1977.

Bell, Eleanor. *The Scottish Sixties: Reading, Rebellion, Revolution?* Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2013

Berger, Thomas. "The power of memory and memories of power: the cultural parameters of German foreign policy-making since 1945" in *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, ed. Jan Muller-Werner, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Boyce, George D. *Decolonisation and the British Empire, 1775-1997*. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1999.

Buettner, Elizabeth. *Europe after Empire: Decolonization, Society, and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Breward, Christopher, Fiona Fisher, Ghislane Wood. *British Design: Tradition and Modernity after 1948*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Childs, David. *Britain Since 1945: A Political History*, 6th Edition. London: Routledge, 2006.

Conekin, Becky E. *The Autobiography of a Nation: The 1951 Festival of Britain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Corum, James S. *Rearming Germany*. Leiden: BRILL, 2011. Accessed November 5, 2019. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Danilova, Nataliya. *The Politics of War Commemoration in the UK and Russia*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Deighton, Anne. "The Past in the Present: British Imperial Memories and the European Question" in *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*, ed. Jan Muller-Werner, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Finlay, Richard. *Modern Scotland: 1914-2000*. London: Profile Books, 2004.

Geraghty, Christine. *British Cinema in the Fifties*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Hewison, Robert. *Cultural Capital: The Rise and Fall of Creative Britain*. London: Verso, 2014.

Hewison, Robert. *Culture and Consensus: England, art and politics since 1940*. London: Methuen London: 1995.

Hewison, Robert. *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties, 1960-75*. London: Methuen London LTD, 1986.

Jolivette, Catherine. *Landscape, Arts and Identity in 1950s Britain*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.

Kitchen, Martin. *The British Empire and Commonwealth: A Short History.* England: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1996.

Keren, Michael. *War Memory and Popular Culture: Essays on Modes of Remembrance and Commemoration*, London: McFarland and Company, Inc, Publishers, 2009.

Marwick, Arthur. *British Society Since 1945*. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

McIntyre, W. David. *British Decolonization, 1946-1997.* England: Macmillan Press Ltd, 1998.

Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *The Arts in the 1970s: Cultural Closure*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Muller, Jan-Werner, ed. *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Noakes, Lucy, and Pattinson, Juliette, eds. British Cultural Memory and the Second World War. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2013. Accessed July 30, 2019. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Olick, Jeffery K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Richards, Jeffery. *Films and British National Identity: From Dickens to Dad's Army*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Saunders, Robert. *Yes to Britain! The 1975 Referendum and Seventies Britain*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Speiser, Peter. *The British Army of the Rhine: Turning Nazi Enemies into Cold War Partners*. Baltimore: University of Illinois Press, 2016. Accessed November 5, 2019. ProQuest Ebook Central.

Turner, Barry. *Beacon for Change: How the Festival of Britain Shaped the Modern Age*. London: Aurum Press LTD, 2011.

Walker, Susannah. *1950 Modern: British Style and Design*. Oxford: Shire Publications, 2012.

Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society: New Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Whittle, Matthew. *Post-War British Literature and the "End of Empire"*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.